

1941, before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Patents, Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM, of Texas, chairman, have been postponed until Wednesday, November 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the caucus room of the old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, November 13, 1941, at 10 a. m., to consider the following bills:

H. R. 5588. To authorize the issuance of certificates of service to applicants for engine-room ratings on vessels, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5672. To authorize the issuance of certificates of service to applicants for engine-room ratings on vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1061. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to \$30,918,000 (H. Doc. No. 429), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 1381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5711) for the relief of Kenneth A. Rotharmel, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 5970. A bill to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorize the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchases of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5971. A bill to abolish temporary enlistments in the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5972. A bill to authorize recommitment of certain graduates of the United States Military Academy in the Regular Army who

are now on active duty as officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 5973. A bill to provide that the compensation of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, shall be \$25 for each day during which the Congress or either House thereof is in session; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the German Government and the Government of the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5974. A bill for the relief of A. H. Bittenbring; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 5975. A bill for the relief of Cecil Higgenbottom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5976. A bill for the relief of Ambrose William Cocks; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 5977. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 5978. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACIORA:

H. R. 5979. A bill for the relief of Andrew Parrish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEYER of Maryland:

H. R. 5980. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5981. A bill for the relief of Harold D. Swears; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5982. A bill for the relief of Raymond K. Harmon; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 5983. A bill granting a pension to John Shipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5984. A bill for the relief of Solomon Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, October 27, 1941)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, in whom the souls of nations live, kindle in us such perfect trust in Thee that no unworthy ambition may bring us under the blighting influence of the great material world with its temporary fascinations, causing us to drift into spiritual indifference. Give to us as a people that insight from which spring our love of country, courage for her defense, and the statesman's faith in her destiny. May we never for-

feit our enthusiasm for the soil on which our history has been achieved, on which our hearthstones and our altars lie, and may we never lose the spirit of devotion to our God, by which we can determine the measure of true patriotism.

Bless our President with every blessing, endue him with wisdom and strength sufficient for the exactions of his high and holy office, sanctify his gifts of leadership to the unifying of our people and the increase of their zeal for God and the Nation's weal, that we may worthily magnify Thy name in righteousness by which alone a nation is exalted.

In our Saviour's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 6, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Nye
Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Barbour	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Herring	Schwartz
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smathers
Bridges	Hughes	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bunker	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lee	Tobey
Capper	Lodge	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wellgren
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley
Doxey	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Norris	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FIRES ON PUBLIC DOMAIN AND OTHER LANDS—AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL CODE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 633) to amend the Criminal Code in respect to

fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned by the United States, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "willfully", to insert "and without authority so to do"; on page 1, line 9, to strike out "by" and insert "or leased by or under the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of"; on page 2, line 15, after "act", to insert "or under statutory authority for addition to a park or wildlife refuge"; on page 2, line 20, after "States", to insert "unless an allottee sets or causes to be set any fire in the reasonable exercise of his proprietary rights in the allotment"; on page 3, line 3, to strike out "or controlled by" and insert "controlled or leased by, or under the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of"; on page 3, line 8, after "525)", to insert "or under statutory authority for addition to a park or wildlife refuge"; and to amend the title so as to read "An act to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned or leased by, or under the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States."

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The memorial of Minnie Giraldi, of Paterson, N. J., remonstrating against lend-lease measures; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Copeland, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. NYE:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that the Neutrality Act be not modified, and also praying for the enactment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or conveying articles or materials to belligerent countries; to the table.

MODIFICATION OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT—PETITIONS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present various petitions of citizens of Bennington, Vt., supporting repeal of the Neutrality Act. I ask that the body of one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD without the signatures.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to lie on the table, and the body of one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

The Neutrality Act, when passed, gave promise of serving the best interests of the United States. It has now become abundantly clear that it only makes our position in the world more hazardous, since it interferes with the delivery of American aid to those countries resisting Axis aggression. We therefore urge the repeal of the act so that we can exert our full strength toward the defeat of Hitler.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of the Committee on the District of Columbia were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

H. R. 5708. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; without amendment.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 5757. An act to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 821).

The following reports of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

H. R. 4795. An act to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, by amending sections 203 (4), 208 (3), 209, 213, 215, 220, and 222 thereof, and by adding thereto a new section to be numbered section 225, all relating to the powers, duties, and functions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission; with amendments (Rept. No. 822);

H. R. 4904. An act to authorize transportation of employees of the United States on vessels of the Army Transport Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 823);

H. R. 5076. An act to empower the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Kauai to issue improvement bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 824); and

H. R. 5374. An act to authorize the transportation of employees of the Alaska Road Commission, and to validate payments made for that and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 825).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2035. A bill to amend sections 345 and 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2036. A bill for the relief of James Dunsmore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 2037. A bill for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 2038 (by request). A bill to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the western judicial district of Pennsylvania to the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2039. A bill to amend section 5136 of Revised Statutes of 1873, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 24) to authorize the reimbursement of directors, officers, and employees of national banking associations for expenses incurred by them in connection with the defense of actions, suits, or proceedings instituted against them in their official capacity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 2040. A bill to strengthen the defenses of the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 2041. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MEAD submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL ON REPEAL OF NEUTRALITY ACT

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the repeal of the Neutrality Act delivered by him on November 5, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES ON FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF DEDICATION OF STATUE OF LIBERTY

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered at ceremonies in connection with the fifty-fifth anniversary of the dedication of the Statue of Liberty, on October 28, 1941, which appear in the Appendix.]

PEACE OR WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator JOHNSON of California on the subject, Peace or War, delivered in Washington on November 6, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CARAWAY, BY MEREDITH HOWARD

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio statement by Meredith Howard with regard to Senator CARAWAY, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT'S NEXT FOR AMERICA—ADDRESS BY HON. PHIL LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Phil La Follette on November 1, 1941, on the subject, What's Next for America? which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WAR—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Times-Herald of November 6, 1941, under the title, "Leading the War March."

STAND OF IRELAND ON NEUTRALITY—ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT BRENNAN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hon. Robert Brennan, Minister to the United States from Ireland, giving the viewpoint of the Irish people on neutrality, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVISION OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HUGHES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of November 7, 1941, relating to the proposed revision of the Neutrality Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRIKES AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM— ADDRESS BY R. J. THOMAS

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers of America and Vice President of the C. I. O., relating to strikes in defense industries, which appears in the Appendix.]

PASTORAL BY ARCHBISHOP McNICHOLAS ON COMMUNISM AND NAZI-ISM

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a pastoral by Archbishop McNicholas, of Cincinnati, on communism and nazi-ism, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWENTY-EIGHTH NATIONAL TRADE CONVENTION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Final Declaration of the Twenty-eighth National Foreign Trade Convention held at New York, N. Y., October 6, 7, and 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR THE STARVING PEOPLE OF EUROPE—EDITORIAL FROM FORT WAYNE (IND.) NEWS-SENTINEL

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, of October 22, 1941, relative to the program of supplying food to the starving people of Europe, which appears in the Appendix.]

MODIFICATION OF NEUTRALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House Joint Resolution 237, which was intended to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES for himself, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY. I should like to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Neutrality Act of 1939 is hereby repealed; but offenses committed under such act prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of such act or any rule or regulation issued for the enforcement thereof may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such act had not been repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment as offered, the Chair understands, is subject to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], which has precedence over it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have not offered the amendment. What I am doing at this moment is keeping the record clear, refreshing memory about this particular subject. I want the position of the authors of this amendment to be properly understood. They do not abandon the cause for which the amendment was drawn. The authors of the amendment believed, in the beginning of the consideration of the Neutrality Act which is now the law, that it was contrary to

the traditional foreign policy of the United States, namely, the attitude of independence though not isolation.

In order to bring together my position at the date of the original amendment of the Neutrality Act of 1937 and the present date, I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Senate proceedings of October 27, 1939, page 1000. I had offered an amendment, and the clerk read it, as follows:

Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked, this joint resolution shall have no further force or effect; but offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under this joint resolution while it was in force and effect may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of such joint resolution or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolution were still in force and effect.

The amendment was not agreed to.

The Senate will notice that the language of the two amendments is almost identical. The object, of course, is identical, that is, that the United States should free its hands from the crippling effect of a statute which says that in unknown circumstances this country will do so and so. In other words, in the beginning and throughout the history of this law we have believed that the foreign policy of the United States ought to be what it was before the so-called Neutrality Act was passed—one of independence, one of vigor, one of leadership in the world's affairs, in the world's tranquillity, and in the world's spiritual development.

This act has been always regarded by us as a hindrance and an impediment to the quick and effective action which this great country should be able to take whenever an emergency like the present one arises in the world.

When this amendment was presented by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on behalf of its authors, there was pending a House bill which provided for repeal of section 6 of the act. That House bill, I believe, had already been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and this amendment was referred to the same committee. But the proposition as it stood in a parliamentary sense was solely the repeal of section 6 of the act, relating to the arming of merchantmen. The proposal did not contain what it now contains as it comes from the Committee on Foreign Relations, namely, the repeal not only of the prohibition against arming merchant vessels but the repeal of those prohibitions which exclude privately owned vessels of nationals of the United States from belligerent ports, and which exclude them and the nationals of the United States from zones of the sea which are prescribed or proscribed by a proclamation of the President.

Now, Mr. President, the scene has changed. The cause for this amendment is not so great. The committee broadened the scope of the resolution. To be sure, if the Congress of the United States promptly should pass a complete repealer of the Neutrality Act, such conduct would

serve notice on the enemies of the United States that this country does not pretend to be neutral, and that this country is again free, that the arms of this country are again released, so that it can take any course which the Congress of the United States sees fit to take, and any other administrative course which the Executive of this Government sees fit to take; and that action can be taken forthwith when the necessity occurs, and will not have to be delayed for weeks and weeks while we discuss a question which events have outrun by months of time and by immense and fundamental changes in conditions.

But the passage of the resolution as it was reported by the committee would remove the most disabling provisions of the law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very much interested in the matter to which the Senator from Vermont is now addressing himself. On account of his eminence as a lawyer, and his familiarity with foreign relations, I hope he will develop fully the point he is now making, and along the lines of pointing out to the Senate that what we are doing is merely freeing ourselves of our domestic self-imposed regulations, and reverting to our status under international law, and that it will not in anywise affect our freedom of action hereafter as to going to war or not, or anything of that kind. I feel that the Senate will be informed if the Senator will develop that situation fully.

Mr. AUSTIN. I appreciate the compliment from the Senator from Texas, because I recognize in him a great authority on this subject, as a lawyer, and as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have no intention of taking much time now; I have another official duty to perform and have to return to that as soon as possible, so I shall be as brief as possible.

Let me say, on this point, that this is but a reiteration of my point of view. I have always, every time this subject came to the floor of the Senate, made the same claim as to this attitude of the United States. A foreign policy is nothing but an attitude. It should not be inflexible. A policy should be sufficiently flexible to permit prompt action by the administration which is responsible for the protection and care of 130,000,000 people in their international relations. This is true, not only in the case of the pending measure, but in connection with every step which the Government of the United States has taken to defeat Hitlerism, and to preserve freedom and free government on earth. Every step we have taken has been accompanied by delays, and I regret to say, Mr. President, that I believe that some of these delays have been greatly injurious to the tranquillity of the world.

I subscribed to and voted for the Neutrality Act of 1939 as it was enacted, notwithstanding the fact that I then advocated repeal. I voted for it then because, considering the existing law, it was the

lesser of two evils, and because I believed it would at least help to defeat Hitlerism. I had an affirmative purpose in view, which I expressed on the floor of the Senate at that time, namely, that I wanted the democracies to win; and many of my colleagues will recall what I was subjected to on the floor of the Senate at that time. I have never wavered in my conviction. I have always been firmly persuaded that when Hitler, backed up and animated by the dynamic national socialism of Germany, told us that there are two worlds, and that one of them must fall apart, that the conflict between gold and labor is on; that he represented labor and that we, the capitalistic countries, represented gold—ever since that time I have been firmly persuaded that every one of his acts was characterized by that declaration. That theory was a part of the *res gestae*, that characterized every one of his aggressions. That colossal design began to operate in the taking of Austria, of Czechoslovakia, of Poland, of Denmark, and of the invasion of the Netherlands and of Luxembourg. That was a part of the Franco-German armistice. That was a part formation of the Axis between the totalitarian powers. That characterizes today Hitler's filling the waters of the world with submarines and preying upon merchantmen wherever they are. That declaration of warfare, of the avowed object of conquest by national socialism in the world, characterized the sinking of every one of the American merchantmen and of the American naval vessels.

Mr. President, it has long been clear to me that Hitler has a definite plan of conquering us with his national socialism without military attack, if he can, but at all events he has the definite purpose of conquering us.

A long series of assaults upon one country after another, and upon the well-known rights of the United States, establishes conclusively the fact that Hitler, and not his victims, determines that they shall either surrender or defend themselves.

I ask this question of those who oppose every step we take to fortify the arm of the United States so that it may do whatever is necessary to defeat Hitlerism in the world and to preserve the blessings of liberty—I ask them what they think the position of the United States would be when the waters of the Atlantic and of the Pacific were under the entire military and naval control of Hitler, if they came under his control.

Mr. President, it is not necessary to visualize the surrender of these waters by us without a fight and the possession of them by German submarines alone. There is another picture that it seems to me must be considered, and that is the outflanking of these oceans in the capture by national socialism of the entire Eastern Hemisphere. Mr. President, common sense tells us that two life lines to this country would be cut off if the oceans were only outflanked by the domination of the Eastern Hemisphere by the aggressor.

There are some 17 strategic materials, there are also 22 critical materials, for which this country is dependent in part or in whole upon the Eastern Hemisphere, and they can be obtained only if they can be transported across either the Atlantic Ocean or the Pacific Ocean. And so, Mr. President, what is the meaning of opposition today to every step by which this Government undertakes to make itself strong, to make itself vigorous, to serve notice upon those enemies of liberty and of justice and of good order, that this country will resist to the utmost the capture and control of the seas by conquest, or the outflanking of the seas by dominion over the entire Eastern Hemisphere? The idea that this country can be isolated is gone forever. This country cannot stand on the side lines and be unaffected and unharmed by what is going on either on the waters of the world or in the Eastern Hemisphere.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If Hitler should be allowed to win, is it not true that then the United States would change from a have nation to a have not, and these strategic materials to which the Senator referred, we would have to ship in, if at all, on the sufferance of the Axis Powers? Is that not true?

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree with that, Mr. President. Indeed, that is what I claim as a reason why we should pass the pending joint resolution; and, Mr. President, let me say that whatever strength I have—whatever conviction I can possibly convey—I give to the support of the joint resolution in its present form. As one of the three Senators who sponsored the amendment which I caused to be read at the desk, I make no further offer of it, considering two things: One is that it is unnecessary because the principal part of the Neutrality Act will be removed by the passage of the joint resolution as it appears in the Senate, and the other is that, in any event, the remaining features of the Neutrality Act are practically taken care of in other laws that are upon our books. So that the substantial reason for our support of this type of legislation from the beginning, namely, the defeat of Hitlerism and the preservation of the spirit of liberty in the world, is the basis of our support of the joint resolution as it appears on the floor.

Mr. President, I have listened to a good deal of argument which did not appeal to me as sound. One contention is that, assuming we did run the risk of having our liberty taken away through the invasion of this country by an ideology transplanted here against the will of some of us, the other great danger—a military attack on the continent of the United States—could not happen to us.

Mr. President, is the ocean any farther across going from east to west than it is going from west to east? How are we going to reconcile the contentions of those who claim that we here in the United States are perfectly secure behind the Atlantic Ocean from military attack, and that if we repeal this act it means the

sending of a military force to Europe? I have heard the answers. Oh, the Axis Powers do not have ships enough to bring the necessary soldiers here. But, Mr. President, if we should surrender the seas they might acquire from the British, as they have from the French and Italians, the ships to cross the ocean. That ocean is no deeper to drown the ships of Hitler than it is to drown the ships of the United States.

The coast of Europe is bristling with fortifications and means of repelling an invader. The defenses of England are concentrated in a small area where the tremendous arts of defense are perfected. But what is our situation? Our continent has an enormous coast line. No one will deny that, with the number of ships we have for the defense of our coast line and the type and quantity of our coast defense fortifications we are vulnerable. How anybody who has any concept of the need of defense for his country could object to a law which would permit the arming of merchantmen is something I cannot understand. If we admit every claim made—that they are but feeble weapons and that practically they cannot do much good—for God's sake, let us provide even that much to defend this broad coast of ours!

Mr. President, as a matter of resistance to this aggression upon the ocean, this attempt to infest with submarines the waters encircling us, threatening the very life of our Nation, I would convert every merchantman into a naval vessel by arming it not only for defense, to shoot from its stern when it is running, but by arming it in its bow, to shoot head-on, and shoot first.

We are not making the attack. The war guilt cannot be nailed to us. Since Hitler met with the factory workers in a munitions plant and made his declaration of war upon all the world there has not been a moment when we have been safe and have not been under attack. Every time Hitler sinks a vessel of the United States it is an attack characterized by his original declaration; and we will either do what his other victims have done, and become enslaved, or we will fight every step of the way to retain our freedom. The character of our fight will necessarily be determined by the character of his aggressions.

We are not going to send an expeditionary force to Europe. Why? Because the character of our defense does not depend upon it; because it would be bad strategy; because it would be unwise. But, Mr. President, are we so cowardly that by our action in this body we are willing to declare to Hitler that we dare not do it? The notice that we serve on the world at this particular juncture will show our determination either to do everything that is essential to the defeat of Hitlerism and the preservation of the blessings of liberty or that we are not united in this purpose.

There is another untenable argument. Some claim that the repeal of the Neutrality Act would lead to war. Others that the repeal of the Neutrality Act would be a step toward war. Let us com-

pare that argument with the argument which was made when the enactment of the act occurred. It was said then that the enactment of the act was a step toward war. How can we reconcile these two doctrines for the 130,000,000 people who are as desperately concerned as we are in the tranquillity of this country and the preservation of its institutions?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think no one in the Senate can better perform this service than can the Senator from Vermont. I am intrigued by his treatment of this particular matter. Let me ask the Senator this: Is it not true in a measure that those opposing the joint resolution have started with the assumption that the mere passage of the joint resolution, in and of itself, would be entrance into the war?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not that argument pure sophistry? Would we in any wise change our status, except to revert to our own freedom of action? Would not the Congress, the President, and all the other branches of government be entirely free in the future, as they are now, to meet the issues when they arise? As the Senator so wisely suggests, does not the character of our defense depend wholly upon the character of the offense and the attacks upon us from Hitler and his hordes?

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Texas for his illuminating statement. I think there has been some disagreement among us about the meaning of the words we use. When we say war, for example, we do not all use the word in the same sense. It may be said that when we repealed the 1937 Neutrality Act and adopted the existing law it was an act of political warfare. Some of us accompanied it with a declaration that we did that thing to defeat Hitlerism and to preserve liberty. There has not been an appropriation made for the particular purpose of building weapons, ships, and other munitions that could not have been called an act of political or defensive warfare. Every one of them had in it the element of an affirmative act—doing something and not merely passively sitting back and doing nothing. Mr. President, I think it could be said with realism that calling out the National Guard, the Draft Act, the transfer of vessels, the opening of our ports to the British for the repair of their warships, and all the other acts to expedite the preparation of our defense in this country represented a certain type of warfare, and were not acts which necessarily lead to a declaration of war.

Mr. President, here is the point, as I see it: Some use the word "war" and the words "leads to war" in the sense that we shall send an expeditionary force to Europe right away. Mr. President, I believe, as the Senator from Texas expressed it, that no man can correctly charge that any act of this Congress leads to war in the sense in which I understand those who oppose the joint resolution use the word "war." As I understand them, they use the word

"war" in the sense in which it should be used if a declaration of war had occurred in Congress. These acts of ours which would stop this man wherever he might attack us can be called war by some persons, if they choose to do so, but they are not the kind of acts of war which have scared the people of this country. They are not the acts of war concerning the great groups of ladies who came down here to petition the Congress. We shall not have that kind of war, Mr. President, without the question having been submitted to the Congress of the United States, and until the Congress, in the light of the facts that then exist, has found it necessary either to declare that a state of war exists, or to create it by a declaration.

We make no promises. The Congress makes no commitments. When it repeals an act that ties its hands, as the Neutrality Act does; when it takes away these shackles so that it can act out on the seas in the defense of American nationals, in the defense of the security of American spirituality, I say that is not war in the sense in which I understand the opponents of the joint resolution charge it is war. I say that is self-defense, and it is the only legitimate and honorable thing that the United States of America can do. Believe me that as a responsible member of the Government of the United States I would hide my face in shame if I did not do my part toward it. They cannot pull down the flag of the United States while I am standing by and have me remain inactive and silent. Certainly they cannot pull down the flag of the United States and expect me to push back the boys and cry, "Oh, do not do anything; do not do anything! It will be a step to war."

Mr. President, it could be assumed that every single one of the statutes we have passed—and each of them is very important—are steps to war in the sense in which the opposition is understood to use that word. I do not assume it, but I say you could do so; and if you used the same logic you would also have to agree that if they were to do nothing at all, if they were to enact no legislation, such denial of legislation would also lead to war; for the victims of Hitler do not decide. Hitler decides, and he moves without warning. First he invades with his insidious "fifth column," by which he pacifies and isolates and calms the people, assuring them they are in no danger; and then he comes down with his horrible, cruel machine, the like of which has never before been known in the world, and the spirit of which belongs to the devil. Mr. President, we had much better assume that we shall be in war, if we are going to defend ourselves and are going to refuse to surrender; we had better assume the worst that could come to us if we did not act, and act vigorously, to preserve this country and to meet every aggression with all the might and power we have.

Mr. President, I foresee our meeting both these dangers—aggression of this country by national socialism and aggression of this country by military force successfully. They will be resisted because an administration here has fore-

seen these events, has correctly interpreted them, and has moved as fast as it could to transform a country which had become almost entirely isolationist and pacifist into the most powerful military country on earth. That is what we must be, Mr. President. Nothing short of perfection will do. This country faces the greatest danger it has ever encountered, and we should not falter now; we will not falter now.

There is great significance in what we do. We cannot afford, as I see it, to quibble over sections. I do not hesitate to abandon, for the time being, the amendment to repeal the whole act in order that I may contribute to the strength which results from unity. Our responsibility for these decisions involves the security of 130,000,000 people. Upon us is the responsibility. Every resource of the United States should be summoned and thrown into action as quickly as possible to defeat Hitlerism and to save this country and its institutions.

In what I have said I have been thinking of the Atlantic Ocean; but, Mr. President, there is danger in the Pacific as well. Perhaps the degree of danger is different, but it is just as tangible. The attacks upon the *Panay* and the *Tutuila* were in character just as much attacks by national socialism upon this country as were the attacks on the 11 merchant vessels and the 4 naval vessels which have occurred on the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. President, let us not forget our duty in the East. Whatever may be our views now about the wisdom or folly of it, when it annexed them this great country undertook the obligation of protecting the Philippine Islands; and when it separated them from us, on paper, it undertook until 1946 the defense of the Philippine Islands and retained the determination of the foreign policy of those islands. They are in the very pathway of war; all the dangers that stir the pool over there surround our nationals in the Philippine Islands. Can we isolate ourselves and refuse to take forthwith the means which will serve notice on a country that is singularly susceptible to notice that we are prepared to resist certain actions and activities; that we are going to arm all types of vessels; that we are going to augment our Navy on the Pacific with vessels which, though now principally devoted to transporting merchandise and passengers, will carry some sailors who are good shots? Mr. President, the moral effect of the passage of this resolution in its present form by a good-sized majority of the Congress would have a tremendous influence to deter Japan.

Mr. President, there is another feeble argument that we have heard here, and that is that we are too weak to help others; that we are unprepared. Assuming that we are going to prepare as fast and furiously as we can, still we are too weak to help others. Yet in the same argument, on the same issue, the claim is made, "Why, we can lick the world; we can lick Hitler; all we have to do is to stay here and go on preparing, and after he has licked all the rest of the world we can take him on and lick him." Mr. President, how absurd to say that we are

too weak to send our ships loaded with supplies and manned by American crews to Britain and to Russia in order to fend off the attacks on both sides of us? Is there any letter or more appropriate means of defense than this? Is there any more effective protection of our facilities for production and for time in which to become perfectly prepared than this?

We do not need an American expeditionary force in order to meet the kind of attack we are suffering; we need ships to take the place of British ships which are sunk in the sea, in order to get American goods across to those fighting against Hitler; and that is one of the objects, one of the principal purposes of this resolution.

Mr. President, I have talked longer than I should have, and I am about to conclude, but I wish to say that I feel we are dealing more rationally with this problem than we did with the problem of World War No. 1. I believe that we have a quickened sense of the value to us of our institutions, I think we have learned from the bitterness of sorrow and suffering the value of the spiritual things of life and of Government; so that now we are ready to deal with this problem not as an introvert nation that contemplates nothing but its own selfish policy and purpose and interest, but as dealing with a situation vital to the future of all mankind. We have come to see that it is important, perhaps it is absolutely necessary, that this great country shall take a part, and that when the time comes to determine what the future of this world shall be this country must not run out on the rest of the world, and try to crawl into a shell of isolationism. We have learned, Mr. President, that these higher values cannot be maintained in the world if we allow Hitler to dictate the terms of a new world order. We know that these institutions of ours, for which our forefathers shed their blood, these great institutions of liberty and freedom for Christianity, have a spiritual foundation without which they could not exist; and, knowing that, we are bound to see to it that the new order in the world shall not be dictated by Hitlerism or national socialism, but shall be worked out by governments whose source of power and whose source of ideals is in the spiritual relationship of mankind.

Mr. President, we should not pass laws either carelessly, or purposely, which will set up a future for the United States of such isolation that it must maintain a totalitarian form of government and an almighty strong military and naval power in order to live; but we should so conduct ourselves in this Congress and in the executive department and all other departments of the Government of the United States as to promote a peace in the world that is founded upon spiritual principles of consideration for others as well as ourselves, and that involves self-discipline by us and by other nations, perhaps not as fine as the self-discipline that some individuals have attained, but far better than any the world has seen before.

This is a magnificent opportunity, Mr. President. Let us come out boldly and make the right decision.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate on this occasion with the deepest sense and feeling of humility, I am not an expert on foreign affairs.

I am pleased upon this occasion to be permitted to follow my distinguished friend from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. Since the early days of the history of the country Vermont and Kentucky have walked side by side. It is good today that in the interest of the defense of the people of the country the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kentucky may again stand side by side, representing in part those two great States, and ask their colleagues to support the country's policy in this critical hour.

Mr. President, I intend to support the pending joint resolution, not because I want the United States to go to war—because I devoutly hope and pray that we can be saved from such a catastrophe—but because I want the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, to be free to deal with the pressing problems of the Government in this critical hour. I want the merchant ships of the United States to be armed in their own defense. It matters little to me whether the ships of the United States go into belligerent ports; but I want them to have the right to go if it is necessary that they go in defense of the people of the United States.

It is apparent to me that the repeal of the so-called arms embargo in 1939 was in no sense a return to international law. The Neutrality Act of 1939 was designed to meet conditions which had arisen during the World War of 1914-18, which made it seem prudent to restrict the movements of American citizens, American vessels, and American cargoes in order to avoid dangerous controversies with belligerents.

Mr. President, that was a noble experiment. It was a noble gesture, brought to the people of the country by the President of the United States to try to avoid, if humanly possible, the sinking of American ships, which brought us to the brink of war in 1917. When it was enacted, there appeared little possibility that the aggressor nations had in mind world domination, or that they would make a serious bid for control of the seas.

Since then the situation has entirely changed. Continental Europe has been overrun by armies bent on conquest. One peaceful country after another has gone down under the military force of these aggressors, and a large portion of the population of Europe has been enslaved.

I desire to digress to refer to a statement made yesterday by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I may not have gotten his feeling, but I felt that I did. He said what so many of the peoples of the world have said: "Let us wait a while. Let us not do it now." Mr. President, there are so many of them who are suffering now because it was "too late and too little," and they failed to realize the seriousness of the situation.

The Neutrality Act of 1939 constituted a complete abandonment of all the principles of freedom of the seas and neutral rights for which America had fought in

1798, in 1805, in 1812, and in 1917. The President of the United States in 1939 expressed the belief that the arms embargo was vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace. But in order to avoid, as I say, such occurrences as those which had brought us into the war in 1917, we forbade all vessels and citizens to go to any European belligerent port, thereby inviting the Germans to sink on sight all neutral ships without fear of any protest from the Government of the United States.

Hitler and his associates took full advantage of this opportunity, and they realized that the new standard of 1939 was not an entirely unmixed blessing for their enemies. Twenty-two years ago, however, the United States had gone to war with Germany rather than accept the German terms, which would have allowed one American vessel to go to Britain each week.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has had a vision with respect to the world situation not equalled, in my opinion, by that of any contemporary statesman of our time. Early in 1939 the President earnestly requested that the Congress of the United States, in view of the alarming situation throughout the world, repeal the arms embargo. Congress adjourned in August of 1939 without agreeing to his request; and the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, made the statement that he had private sources of information, upon which he relied, superior to those relied upon by the President of the United States and Mr. Hull, and that, according to those sources of information, there would be no war in Europe in 1939.

When the storm broke in September, it proved that the President was right. It proved that his critics were wrong. Of course, hindsight is better than foresight; but Hitler knew that he was armed and prepared for war, and Hitler knew that his enemies were not prepared for war, and he knew that the most powerful nation in the world, the only source of supply open outside of those countries, was the United States of America; and we had refused to repeal the arms embargo, thereby shutting off to England and France and the Allies any opportunity to compete in any measure with Mr. Hitler in the race for armaments.

When the storm broke it looked as if Hitler had the whole thing sewed up, because he had been preparing for war since 1933. He went before his Reichstag on the 1st day of September and said:

I have made a peace agreement with Russia. In 1917 Russia and Germany fought on opposite sides. Both were the losers. That will never happen again. We have negotiated a friendship pact.

And knowing that he was armed, knowing that his opponents were unarmed, thinking that he was secure against attack from the east, you know the rest. The result is in the archives of history.

While the preamble of the Neutrality Act stated that we waived none of our rights and privileges or those of our nationals under international law, the text of the act was an utter and complete abandonment of neutral rights and

freedom of the seas. By this act the President, in response to the pleas of the people of America, earnestly desiring to avoid, if possible, bringing America into the war, asked the Congress of the United States to abandon temporarily these rights in the interest of the safety of all the people of the country; and we did. The great neutral, the biggest neutral in the world, led all the other neutrals in closing the high seas to the use of our own ships, this in spite of the fact that we had always insisted, from time immemorial, upon full respect of our right to be free upon the high seas.

That this act has failed to accomplish its purpose is apparent. That we must at once repeal so much of the act as hampers the free actions of the Government of the United States is certain. We must serve notice on the German Government that we intend to arm our merchant ships in their own defense.

It is said the armed ships did not sink any submarines during the last war, and it is also said we cannot arm the ships. There is a man in charge of arming the merchant ships now, and I wish to quote something from the current issue of *Time* magazine:

Admiral Blandy, 51-year-old officer of the Navy, was an ordnance and gunnery expert on the U. S. S. *New Mexico* from 1927 to 1929. They called him "Meat Ball," and his pals said his idea of gunnery and "perfect target practice was to shoot the masts off the target ship at 8,000 yards, starting with the top and working down. Throwing shells into the hull was like shooting fish in a bucket for him."

While the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] was telling the Senate a day or so ago that we could not arm the ships, this man was quietly getting ready to do the job, and said he could have a thousand of them armed in the next 4 or 5 months.

Mr. President, it is easy to criticize, it does not require any real vision to criticize, and the critics of the President of the United States have told the people of the country that we are not prepared. Whose fault is that? Is that the fault of the President of the United States? It is not. Is that the fault of those of us who have stood here day after day and voted for every measure we have thought would be helpful and useful in the defense of the people of the United States? It is not. Is it the fault of those who said we had nothing to fear—that "nobody is going to get you, nothing is going to happen to you"?

I read again from *Time* magazine:

This week production news dominates the Nation's defense report. The Navy is getting a growing flow of real armament. Tank production is booming, and United States airplane production will, according to expert opinion, pass Nazi output before January 1.

I quote Mr. Wright, the assistant chief of O. P. M.'s aircraft branch.

The defense of the United States and the products we expect to use in the defense of the country are no longer on order; they are in production; and by the 1st day of January 1942 the United States will be making 2,400 military airplanes a month. Germany will be making 2,250. England will be making in the neighborhood of 1,900 a month. We

have already, in this short time, passed the ability of Hitler to produce military airplanes. Why do not the critics say something about that? We are not as well prepared as I wish we were, but we are much better armed than the critics of the administration's foreign policy say we are.

Mr. President, we must serve notice on the German Government that we intend to see that shipments of munitions and supplies authorized under the Lease-Lend Act reach their destination in safety. We must not permit England and Russia to fall through our failure to supply them with the munitions and supplies which they so urgently need at this time. We must rely—we have to rely—upon the strength of the President of the United States and Mr. Hull and their ability to deal in this tragic hour with these pressing problems.

I repeat what I have said before—if a speech in the Senate would guarantee the peace and security of the people of America I would make one every day; I would make one every hour, subject to my endurance, if I thought that would guarantee the peace and security of the people of the country.

We must rely on this man, thrice elected by the people of the United States to lead this country in its critical hour. Some jeer at Mr. Willkie because he has seen fit to join in the request to the people of the country—the patriotic people—that they support the President in this trying hour. I assume that almost everyone in the country voted for one or the other of these two men in the last election. The two of them received practically all the votes of the people of this country. Whichever one had been elected the foreign policy of this country would have been just as it is now.

In addition to that, Mr. President, we must rely upon a Divine Providence. I believe now, and I have always believed, that Providence usually walks with those who show by their deeds that they merit its protection. There is a destiny which holds the lives of all of us in the hollow of its hand.

We hear talk of American boys being sacrificed to the god of war. The Kentucky boys are just as dear to my heart, and as dear to the heart of my colleague, as are the boys of Montana dear to the heart of the Senator from Montana. Some of the Kentucky boys are in Iceland, there because the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States sent them there.

No one ever heard of a Kentuckian refusing to obey the command of his President when the country was in danger. Our boys are in Iceland. We have to keep the seas to Iceland open. Champ Ligon, the son of the principal of my high school in my boyhood, will be in danger, and I want Champ Ligon, and every other boy in Iceland subject to the orders of his Commander in Chief, whether he is from Kentucky or any other State in the Union, to know that I am not going to desert him.

The seas between the United States and Iceland must be kept open. Those boys must be supplied. If they cannot stay in Iceland, no one who is friendly to

us can stay in Greenland. If they cannot stay in Greenland, they may not be able to stay in Newfoundland, and if they cannot stay in Newfoundland, I say to the Senator from Michigan that he may not be able to stay in Michigan, and I want him to be safe when he is at home.

I used to think, and I admit I was wrong, that we were so strong and so powerful that all we had to do, in case of attack, was to retreat back from the coasts of this country and that nothing would happen to us. I have changed my mind about that. Is it because I want to go to war? Of course, I do not. I was a private during the last war, I am a captain now, and when I vote to send any boy in this country to war I am going to ask for leave and go with my regiment. I am not willing to ask any of these boys to do anything I am not willing to do myself. I would rather be killed fighting for the United States than to have the women and the children of my family killed in their home here by bombs that would rain upon them day and night relentlessly in the years ahead unless we realize that this is a terrific situation.

So from here today I send the word to Champ Ligon, "I am not going to desert you, son." I am going to do everything I can to put the arms of America into the hands of those boys behind the guns.

It is said labor organizations should not support the President. No man has a right to strike against the Government of the United States. When he does it is his last strike; he is "out."

Every patriotic laboring man in America wants to work, wants to mine coal, wants to make airplanes for the defense of America, and no unpatriotic man should be permitted to keep him from doing it, and none will be.

Let me warn labor—and I am a friend of labor—that there is danger that labor may raise up in this army a generation of labor haters, because certain laboring men refuse to supply the men in the Army with the implements of war which they need so badly. If labor should raise up a generation of labor haters, which will raise another generation of labor haters in the years ahead, labor would tear down much of the good which has been accomplished heretofore in behalf of labor. And why should a labor union man support Hitler or any of his associates? There are no labor unions in Germany. They are gone.

Mr. President, for days I have listened to my colleagues quote Senators who in other years, for reasons best known to themselves, have taken one side or the other on important questions. Some of those Senators in years afterwards were honored by the people of their States. But I will say that it is more easy to honor a man after he is dead than it is to honor him while he is living. People are apt to forget what public men have done, and they oftentimes do. When the attention of the people of a State is called to the fact that there was a distinguished Senator from their State who died 50 or 100 years ago the people of that State do not read the Record to find what that Senator said, but they get together and build him a monument. Scant comfort

for abuse heaped upon him during his lifetime.

Mr. President, the present situation is not unlike the one many Senators now in the Senate faced in 1918. I was not here then. I was in the Army then. As I now recall, I do not believe I was conscious of the existence of the Congress. I mean Congress did not seem to make any difference to me at that time. But now every man in the Army knows that Congress is here, because some Congressmen tell the men in the Army now and then, "Just a minute; we will get you out of the Army. In spite of all the trouble existing in the world, we will send you home." Mr. President, the nearest we have come to getting the country into the war was when certain persons declared that we did not need the Army, that nothing was going to happen to us, and that we would send home a considerable number of the men in the Army. In that event Japan would move south from Indochina, and would close the Burma Road, and attack Australia, and then the Japs and Germany together would endeavor to strangle the United States of America.

Mr. President, let me reproduce for Senator: the situation that confronted the United States of America 25 years ago. In March 1916 talk of preparedness in the country vied with the pleas of pacifists in an apprehensive Nation. Senators, remember that. Some persons now say about the President, "You are taking us to war. You are deliberately taking us to war." Senators, that is not so. The President of the United States would ask no greater blessing than to be able in this critical hour to steer his country clear of the shoals of this terrific, destructive war that is going on all around the earth. Why, he has boys of his own in the Army. Do Senators think he wants his boys killed?

Young men in 1916 were leaving their homes and labor for training camps. German periscopes in 1916 were rising in the Atlantic to menace American export trade. It is not quite like that this time, because we have abandoned all our trade to keep out of the way.

Critics of the Wilson administration, just as those of the Roosevelt administration today, were branding the President as a warmonger. Senators, remember that. I wish to quote what the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] said then. He was then a Representative from Virginia. Let me digress to say that the greatest prize that is mine comes from Virginia—that is my wife. My children have that rich and noble ancestry of the Old Dominion State. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is a tradition in Virginia. At the time of the last war he was a Representative from Virginia. He took the floor in the House of Representatives and in a speech made in 1916—25 years ago—he spoke with caution and courage, with frankness and firmness, that commanded not only the respect of the President and the people of his own country but also the respect of the people of foreign nations. He said that the President had for 18 months applied himself to the task of preserving peace without impairing the honor of the

Republic. In his summation he delivered one of the most eloquent pleas ever heard in the Congress of the United States, and I quote:

The President of the United States for many months, by night and day, has kept a vigil for peace.

So has our present President.

With enduring patience, with amazing skill, oblivious of all things else, he has passionately sought, by every conceivable means, to keep this country out of the maelstrom of war. Neither taunt nor threat has shaken his purpose or diverted him from his course. But there are some things better than life, as there are other things worse than death.

It may be possible, Mr. President, I may interject, that those and only those who are willing to risk death may earn for themselves in this critical hour the right to live.

The human body, bereft of the soul which reveals the image of God, is but a whited sepulcher; and so a nation with its righteous spirit quenched is as a tossing derelict of the sea.

And finally he lashed out at the propaganda of the pacifists—and I do not use the word "pacifist" in derision, for our Lord said:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

But they now cry, "Peace, peace," and there is no peace, and they beg and implore and demand and try to coerce the President of the United States to make peace with a fellow whose word is no good, and has not been good to anyone to whom he has given it in this whole crisis. How can the President make peace with a man who disregards every instrument, every statute, every commitment, and every promise? How can Senators expect their President to rely upon him? Why, every time any nation made a friendship pact with Hitler, that meant that he was simply going to put that nation over to the side to wait its turn, and just as soon as he got through with the affair in hand he would take over that nation.

I continue to quote from the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Like unto the proposal to discredit the Nation is the pathetic, perfervid talk about desolating American homes and distressing American mothers by sacrificing their sons to the god of war.

Senators, I would not be demagogue enough to stand before a group of American fathers and mothers and say to them, "You do not want your boys to be killed, do you?" The son of my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] is in the Army. I would not hold out to the people a guaranty that their sons would not have to go to war. Let me continue to quote from Senator GLASS:

The pathetic, perfervid talk about desolating American homes and distressing American mothers by sacrificing their sons to the god of war. The nearest approach—

This is in 1916—

The nearest approach to war which this country has recently made was when Members of Congress sought to impede the President's plan for maintaining an honorable peace.

In my opinion, the nearest approach we have made to war recently was the failure of Congress to answer the President's request promptly and say to the Army of the United States that we do not know when it can go home. When I was in the Army I was asked what I wanted. Every time I said, "I want to go home." If any man in the present Army is asked what he wants, he will say, "I want to go home." Why do we not have courage enough to say to them, "We do not know when you can go home. God alone knows. But you cannot go now. You must stay until we see this thing through?"

The surest prelude to intolerable affront from one direction is the manifestation of a cowardly submission from the other; and unless it be conceived that no injury, however great, no insult, however grievous, could provoke this Nation to resentment, the course proposed by meddling resolutions is most certain to invite aggression and ultimately to precipitate war.

And there are some things worse than war. Virginia has homes which might be desolated and mothers who might be distressed and some who might be sacrificed.

So has Kentucky; so has Michigan; so has Colorado; so has Alabama. I am thinking now of young Caesar Kaiser, an aviator in training in Texas, who crashed out over the western desert. His brother Bill is one of my dearest friends. I had everyone in the Army I could find go out to seek that lad. The ship crashed in the mountains. What could I say to his mother except, "He is dead on the field of honor"? Is that much comfort?

The young men of the present-day Army ask me, "What are we going to get out of this?" What did we get out of the last war? We did not want anything. We wanted to live in peace. There was a tyrant then. Hitler makes him look like a minnow. We thought the Kaiser was the worst possible kind of tyrant. He said, "Me und Gott are going to rule the world." This fellow is going to do it by himself. He is not going to take God into account. The other fellow had a junior partner; but this fellow is going to do it by himself. [Laughter.]

That is scant comfort. I say to every young man who is in the Army today, and every young woman who hopes to live in the future, "Perhaps because of what we did in 1917 you have been able to have 23 or 24 years of life. I do not know whether that means anything to you or not." I do not know what the country and the world will be like tomorrow, but it will be what we are willing to make it, in spite of those who seek to destroy. Every generation must pay its own obligations. We cannot pay them. We do the best we can.

Let me continue to quote Senator GLASS:

But I pray God that the mothers and sons of Virginia who live appreciate their heritage from those who, "being dead, yet speaketh." Two of Virginia's boys are my own—

There are men and women here who are saying now, "That is my boy." Among those who are saying it are the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY].

They are our boys, stalwart, manly fellows.

Two of Virginia's boys are my own—stalwart, manly fellows, for either of whom I would die a thousand times—and I would have them hear me say, without a tremor, in the spirit which I hope animates their hearts, that I would rather be pursued through time and eternity by the pitiful apparition of their shattered forms than to see my country dishonored and its flag hauled down in disgrace!

Those words were uttered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia yesterday, but they are just as true today.

There is a dispute going on in the country about when we started to get into trouble this time. I am indebted to Walter Lippmann for the information which I now give. I do not think it has been quite clear. Our opponents have not seen fit to comment on it in this debate in my hearing.

Hostilities between the United States and Germany did not begin with the incident of the *Greer* on September 4, or the *Kearny* incident on October 17, or with the sinking of the *Reuben James* on October 30.

Hostilities, in the sense of shooting, began on May 21, 1941, when a German submarine attacked and sank the *Robin Moor* about half way between Africa and South America. The *Robin Moor* was an unarmed American merchant ship, not traveling in a convoy, bound for Capetown and other African ports. The *Robin Moor* did not refuse to stop and did not resist visit and search. When the *Robin Moor* was destroyed the passengers and crew were placed in open lifeboats hundreds of miles from land and the right to radio the position of their boats or to send an S O S was refused. Only after terrible exposure to the weather, and only by accident, were the survivors rescued without loss of life.

Senators will remember my brief exchange with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] the other day. He said that no American lives have been lost on merchant ships during this war. In answer to that, I said that the Germans are not to be given credit for it because they set the passengers and crew of the *Robin Moor* adrift in the open sea.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. That action was in contravention of the naval treaty of London, entered into in 1930, to which Germany subscribed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator. I was about to reach that point. The Senator anticipated me to that extent. I am glad he did. His statement is exactly correct.

I continue to quote Mr. Lippmann:

The action of the submarine commander has never been disavowed by the German Government. In fact, an effort has been made, in which some American Senators have joined, to justify the act on the ground that the *Robin Moor* was carrying contraband of war to the enemies of Germany. The nature of the ship's cargo was irrelevant.

Under international law, under the London Naval Treaty to which Germany adhered on February 28, 1939, even under the German prize law code promulgated September 3, 1939, it is a rule—

It is their rule. But what is it worth? It is only a treaty. It is only an agreement. It is only a contract; but it is not

worth anything if it is expedient for the Germans to break it.

It is a rule that—

the destruction of vessels * * * is admissible only if the passengers, crew, and papers of the vessels have been brought to a place of safety before destruction. Ship's boats are not to be regarded as a place of safety unless the safety of passengers and crew under the existing condition of the sea and weather is assured by the proximity of land or the presence of another vessel which is able to take them on board.

The *Robin Moor*, unarmed, not in a convoy, outside the American combat zone, outside the German war zone, was sunk lawlessly on May 21, 7 weeks before the American occupation of Iceland, nearly 4 months before the American Navy was ordered to shoot at sight. The fact that the German Government did not disavow the act but sought to justify it established conclusively that by May 21, 1941, Hitler had ceased to recognize in theory or to respect in practice any right of any noncombatant upon the seas. Thereafter it became an American right and an American duty to assume that no American ship could rely upon the protection of international law or of treaties or of domestic American law under the Neutrality Act, and that any German war vessel encountered anywhere was an aggressor.

Why does not the opposition refer to that statement? It carefully disregards it, and tries to make the American people think that the President gave the Navy orders to shoot on sight for no reason at all except that he wanted to get us into war. That is not so. That is not just. That is not fair. The *Robin Moor* was sunk a few months after the passage of the lend-lease bill, and the German Government is entitled, then, to argue that hostilities began on May 21 because at that time the United States had ceased to be a neutral. There is going to be no peace in this world again, Senators, until nations respect law. They have no respect for law; and unless we are going to stand here in the Senate of the United States and agree that we are going to be run off the seas, pretty soon we shall be run out of our homes, too. That will be the next step, because it is inconceivable to me, in view of these actions, that Hitler intends anything other than to have the people of America wait and delay until we are as some of our opponents, perhaps in good faith, would have us. I do not challenge their right to take that position, but it seems to me to be a view which cannot be supported at all by them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Before the Senator leaves his discussion of the *Robin Moor*, I should like to make just one observation, an observation which I made sometime ago. I believe that anyone who thoroughly understands the *Robin Moor* situation must realize that Germany acted willfully and wantonly. The German Government has failed to offer any explanation, and has failed to offer any apology to this Government for the sinking of that ship; and when this Government, through the State Department, requested \$3,000,000

in damages for the sinking of the *Robin Moor*, its request was totally and ignominiously ignored by the Nazi government of Germany—demonstrating to my mind beyond peradventure of doubt that the sinking of the *Robin Moor* was a willful and a wanton act. In my humble opinion it was done for the effect it would have upon the people of South America, to demonstrate to them that Nazi submarines could operate and would operate in that part of the world just as long as they wanted them to, and would create any incidents or would sink any ships they desired. That was a warning to the South American people to "watch out, insofar as your continuation of the good-neighbor policy of the United States of America is concerned."

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator from Illinois; I think the deduction he makes is plausible, and entirely accurate.

The Germans have never understood the people of the United States, although we have given them some reason to understand us. They have always felt that they could frighten us. In the last war they carried on a campaign called *Schrecklichkeit*—that, frightfulness. But our people never have shown a disposition to be scared; and when there have been attempts to frighten them, the results are well known by everyone on earth. But the Germans made their attempt in those southern seas as a warning to South America, as the Senator suggests, and perhaps as a warning to Japan, of what they could do.

I am indebted to Walter Lippmann for the best expression I have gotten with respect to this whole matter. I do not know Mr. Lippmann, but it seems to me he has stated the facts and circumstances in such a way that they are clearly understood and can be understood. He said, in substance, that we are not going to have peace any more until the law among nations has been reestablished, and no peace will endure unless there can arise some organized power who will challenge the authority of those who ruthlessly seek to break the law of nations.

Mr. President, there is not a single American, regardless of whether he believes in the Russian system of government, their religion, or their doctrines, who does not admire the staunch defense the Russian people have made in the protection of their homeland. If Russia falls, and then England falls, the United States will be left in the position for which many of our short-sighted statesmen have seemingly wished—isolated and alone. We must realize that destiny has placed us in a position where we must either protect ourselves or stand idly by and take the consequences, whatever they may be. We must either cooperate while there yet is time and while we have allies and friends, or become reconciled to the final act of this great tragedy, when we shall have to defend ourselves alone.

It is my sincere belief that a defeat for Britain and Russia would bring ultimate disaster to the people of the United States. I never have been able to satisfy

my conscience in trying to figure out how we could defend ourselves against the combined power and resources of this ruthless German dictator. Slave labor would be used to overcome the work of free men, and gradually the aggressors on the east and west would tighten the ring around the United States. I have not believed, and I do not believe now, that we could compete with Germany for South American trade if such a situation came to pass. I do not believe we can pay wages to free men for labor and compete with a fellow who makes slaves do the work when he has the combined resources of all the conquered nations of the earth. I believe the time is near for even our opponents to say to the people of the country, "I have a right to criticize, I have a right to object, I have a right to be against the policy of the Government, but that is a right I will forego now because we have got to have unity in this country if we do this job."

In the years that are ahead I would not want to feel that I had given, either knowingly or unwittingly, aid and encouragement to the enemies of my country. I would not want my speeches quoted in Germany as reflecting the public opinion of the people of the United States. Ah, they are going to make a sad mistake if they quote the speeches of our opponents here, and if they are forced to believe, as they will believe if they can, that those speeches represent the spirit of America. That would be a serious mistake. Oh, my friends, they will have a rude awakening.

I do not want to make a foolish record here. The consequences of what happens to a man politically are of no consequence. I do not have to be in the Senate of the United States; I do not have to hold public office. I have had all the public offices that the people of my State have to give to one of their sons. The thing nearest my heart is to give them, the rest of my life, the best service I can give, as long as they want me. I ask no favors from the President of the United States. It has been suggested here by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] that someone has something to give to a Senator—a judgeship or an office—if he will agree to vote with the administration. I have not seen the President personally for nearly a year. I have never made any request of him. I want to be charged by my people and by the people of America solely with the responsibility of the votes I cast here. Irrespective and regardless of what happens, and how the political winds blow either now or in the future I am not going to pass this way again. Neither are you. I pray to God that He will give me the strength to live aright from day to day, because I know that I am not going to pass this way again. Neither are you. Answer, if you can, to your conscience. I cannot answer to mine if I send Champ Ligon there without a gun. We have sent Champ Ligon and other boys to Iceland and other places, and they have got to be fed and housed and clothed and supported, and I want them to know that "Old Happy" did not turn his back on them and is still fighting for them.

This country must become wide awake to the dangers that threaten it. Every time the statement is made that some danger threatens from the outside someone else says it is not so bad as the danger that threatens inside. It is bad inside, some of it. The newspapers headline strikes and other unfortunate incidents until people are led to believe that there is something wrong with the country. Mr. President, I wish you could go where I have gone from Boston to Los Angeles, from the Presidio to Monterey and south to Gulfport, all over this country, and see the thousands and thousands of patriotic Americans going about their business, serving their President and their country patriotically. Why do not the newspapers write about such people? They do not do so because the average mine-run fellow who supports the country and keeps it going is not news; he is not exciting. God bless the American worker. Give him strength and courage.

We do not escape danger by being weak or being afraid. I wish to tell the Senate a story of one of my mountain friends, not in the spirit of levity, because this, to me, is one of the most serious occasions of my life, but I want to show the spirit of a Kentucky mountaineer. He went down to the blue-grass country to get a gun. Those fellows like guns; they like to have guns. They are not afraid; they will not steal; they will not lie; they will not abuse their neighbors; but if you mistreat them they will kill you. [Laughter.] They do not like to be mistreated. This Kentucky friend of mine went down to the blue-grass region looking for a rifle. He went to a store and he found one there and he asked the clerk how much for the rifle. The clerk said, "\$29.75." He looked at the rifle, stroked it, backed away from it, turned his back on it, came back and put his hand on it again, and said, "Well, I will take her; that's a lot of money, but I will take her, because if I need her and ain't got her, I'll never need her again." [Laughter.] I would rather—and that is the record I have made here—have the word go back to my people that I have supported the request of the President of the United States for arms and implements; I would rather support the measures providing such things, and acquire them and have them and not need them, than to fail to support such requests and not have them and need them, because if we needed them and did not have them, we might never need them again.

Too late, too little; too little, and too late. Read the history of the conquered countries in Europe. Just wait; just wait.

I admit the weakness of the democratic system of government. We criticize the President because he acquires bases and gives destroyers for them. It was said that he should have asked Congress, and it was said he has an obliging Attorney General. Is it not a terrible offense for the President to have an obliging Attorney General? He knows how important it is to have an obliging Attorney General, not that he wants the Attorney General to do wrong but he certainly wants him to be obliging. But it is asked, Why does he not consult Congress? Then when he sends the request to Congress

we delay, we talk, until finally it does not make any difference; every delay gives opportunity for disaster, and this fellow Hitler moves quickly; while others debate, he moves. He was ready to move; we were not ready to move; and the result has been his great success. The other day one of my friends said here that Hitler is the greatest military genius of all time. I am going to reserve my judgment as to that until he gets back from Moscow. Many a would-be general and dictator or conqueror has been lost on the road to Moscow or from Moscow, and I am going to wait until Hitler gets back from there; and I pray every night that he never will get back. [Laughter.]

If a spirit of defeatism is abroad in this country, I am not responsible for it. I started by saying I was not an expert on foreign affairs. I have been here 2 years; I have listened to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], to my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY], and other Senators who know much about foreign affairs; I listened to Senator Pittman, former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, but I know as much as Lindbergh does about foreign affairs. [Laughter.] I do not claim to know as much about aviation as he knows, but he does not know as much about football as I know, for before I began practicing law I made my living coaching football. But I hate to see a fellow warn his country that it has no chance; that it is going to be defeated; that it is going to lose. He would have it losing before it starts. I would not do that; I would not preach defeatism to the people of my country for anything on earth, and I am not going to be responsible for giving aid and comfort to Hitler or any enemy of the United States by trying to make him believe that the United States would be defeated in a conflict. In one moment it is said we are not prepared and the next moment that if Hitler started here it would be impossible for him to ever reach here. We have heard that; but both statements cannot be true.

The President has told us that next year we will make 50,000 military airplanes in this country; that we are going to fill the skies with planes, and so long as England and Russia last we have some friends over there. As to what may happen when they are gone, if they should be defeated, I said yesterday to the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Montana that the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate has answered that question for me. I do not know what they know about it, but they said fort to Hitler or any enemy of the United States would not be necessary; that if Russia and England were defeated and Japan and Germany were free, they could conquer the United States without military invasion of continental United States. How could they do it? The Naval Affairs Committee said they could park aircraft carriers on our shores and bomb the cities and towns of this country from both sides. Mr. President, would you not hate to face the prospect of our Pacific coast line being bombed all the way from Alaska to the tip of southern California? Would you not hate to have

bombing all the way from Maine down to Florida and Key West on the Atlantic coast? We have not enough anti-aircraft guns; I know we have not; it would take a long time to make adequate defense arrangements; but of this I am certain, under this sort of a situation we would have to be a military country as long as anybody here lives and as long as any of our children live. We have never wanted to be a military nation. I do not want my country to be a military nation now. I do not want my country controlled by the military. The burden of armaments in the years ahead might conceivably be heavier than we could bear. We should always have to have money for the Army, and money for the Navy. We should have to withdraw behind these island defenses and be subjected to frequent bombing raids and, the Naval Affairs Committee said, "without the power to carry the fight to the enemy, our only alternative would be subjugation to his wishes."

I coached football in years gone by. I never had my team score a touchdown when the other fellow had the ball. I never saw it happen in my life. You have to have the ball. I want to get this thing in shape so that we can make a move, and Hitler will have to guess where we are going.

All we are doing now, Senator, is to say, "I wonder where he is going to hit us next." My people are getting awfully tired of this fellow. He is disturbing their sleep. He is too much in the news; and down in Kentucky, when people get tired of you, they are tired. [Laughter.] They are worn out, and they do not want to have to guess where this fellow is going to hit them next.

Without the power to carry the fight to the enemy, the Naval Affairs Committee says the only choice we have left is subjugation to his wishes. When? God knows how long; just however long we feel like holding out; and God knows how long we will feel like holding out when they keep dropping those baskets of eggs on us and moving us a little farther back.

If that happens, they are not going to get me as soon as they get you fellows in Maine, or New York, or Connecticut, or California. They are going to get you ahead of me. I am going to be behind the Allegheny Mountains. [Laughter.] I am going to be behind the rivers—at least, my folks are. I shall be with my regiment, but my folks will be there. I want to live; and I am not going to have this RECORD show, if I can help it, that I did not have ordinary gumption—that is, country sense—gumption enough to know that this is a real proposition. This is real.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] was quoted as having said, and Lindbergh was quoted as having said, that this was an imaginary peril. I wonder if the people of Holland and Denmark and Norway have merely imagined what has occurred. Has this thing really happened to them or have they just imagined that something has happened to them? I have not been there, and I have not seen it, but I have a fair idea

that they are not doing as well as they were; yet these fellows say that they just imagine something has happened to them.

I say that you ought to be ashamed to expect the President of the United States and Mr. Hull to try to make peace with a fellow who does not keep his word. Lindbergh says, "Make peace with him." Cudahy says, "Make peace with him." Well, what have you after you make it? To a realistic fellow all that would mean would be, "Just wait until your turn. Wait until I get through what I am doing and I will see you next."

In passing the Neutrality Act the Congress very wisely made an explanation regarding it. I recall that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], when we were in that debate, said that. It is in the preamble of the act. It contains the statement that the United States voluntarily imposes upon its nationals by domestic legislation the restrictions set out in the act; that by so doing the United States of America waives none of its rights or privileges or those of any of its nationals under international law. Then it says—why has not this been told to the people—that the United States expressly reserves the right to repeal, change, or modify the act, or any other domestic legislation, in the interest of the peace and security and welfare of the United States and its people.

We did not pass that act for Hitler. It did not make any difference to me what he thought about it. The Senator from Texas explained to me that we were voluntarily imposing this restriction upon our people, to try to see if it would work. Well, it has not worked. It was an invitation to Hitler to sink everybody else's ships on sight, which he did; and then, when ours got out there, he tried to sink ours, too. We are having our ships sunk without arms. The opponents of this measure say they will be sunk if we put arms on them. Well, a fellow may be whipped without arms, or he may be whipped with arms, but he will have a better chance with arms than he will have without arms. I want to give them a chance. It is no reason to say we will not arm our ships now because in the last war they did not hit anything. In the last war the Germans did not sink many ships, either. In the last war we gave pretty good protection to our ships on the high seas.

Will you not remember that in this critical hour of our Nation's peril this is not a boundary dispute; this is a world revolution? We may not be able to escape it or its consequences. We shall have to prepare ourselves in every way to crush it, if possible, before it gets to us. Churchill seemed to be the only statesman in Europe who realized the futility of dealing with the German military dictator. I do not subscribe to all the statements Churchill has made, but I do not ridicule those magnificent statements made in behalf of his people when he said:

The R. A. F., with fewer planes and fewer men and less training, protected the British Empire in those murderous assaults of 1939 and 1940.

And he said:

Never in the history of the human race has so much been done by so many to so few.

I would not ridicule that statement.

Regardless of your feelings and mine, what I do is not done because I am for any other country on earth than the United States of America. Churchill said that if this dictator came to England, they would fight him in every village, in every town, and on every beach until one or the other had perished. That seems to be the only way to deal with Hitler. Peace in our time will not come, in my opinion, as long as this fellow is loose in the world.

I recently read a book which I recommend to you, *Night Over Europe*. It was written by Dr. Frederick Schuman. In the closing lines of that book he envisions not wish dreams but realities:

In the days to come the fittest will survive and rule the world. The unfit will fail and lose body and soul. The fittest will be those who know that the world is one.

Hitler said there were two worlds in conflict; that one of them must crack, and that "We are not going to be the one." Mussolini said, "We cannot exist side by side. It is either you or us. One of us will have to go."

The fittest will be those who know that national sovereignty and international anarchy are marked for death; that *laissez faire*—

That is, let alone—

feeble government, the rule of money and property are alike lost forever; that new visions and new life-giving deeds must replace the shibboleths of yesterday. The fittest will be those who know how to reconcile their preferences with stubborn facts.

Not what I wish but what is the situation.

The fittest will be those who realize that the world of tomorrow belongs to the peoples who care enough about their way of living to sacrifice their prejudices and their wish dreams as well as their safety and very lives in its defense. Only those are fit who are in form and attuned to the needs of the world as it is, not as they imagine or wish it to be. Only those who see why an old world is dying are fit to make a new world after their hearts' desire. The fit will conquer the future.

Mr. President, all my life, when faced with a serious proposition, when I had the choice of either taking definite, affirmative action and being charged with the responsibility incident thereto, or of doing nothing and taking the consequences, I have been ready and willing and prepared to act. Every Senator must be prepared to act.

I do not want it said—it must not be said—that by delay, by dallying, by failing to see the realities of the situation I placed my country in position when, sad to say, it was too late.

Let the word go out today to every man in the Navy of the United States, to every man in the Army of the United States, that we are in this thing to the finish. We have to be in it. We cannot be out of it. We have to prepare for whatever the morrow brings. Let the word go out. God only knows when men shall be beating their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning

hooks, and war shall be no more. God alone knows. But until that day comes, lest I be of aid or comfort in this critical hour, by some word or act of mine, to the enemies of my country, I ask my Commander in Chief to lead the country. I know the President is not trying to get us into the war. I know he is not trying to do that. I do not know whether he will be able to avoid it or not. I pray to God he will, as God is my helper.

The word must go from here to the Kentucky boys in Iceland, to the boys of the United States forces all over the world, that they have not been deserted, and that we intend to take the initiative and let Mr. Hitler guess awhile what we are going to do.

I reiterate the first statement I made. I do not care whether the ships of the United States go to England or to ports elsewhere in the world, but I want them to have the right to go. I do not want Mr. Hitler to have the right to say that they cannot go. I do not want Mr. Hitler to drive us off the seas. If he does, and if we permit him to do it, God alone knows what the future will hold in store for this country.

Mr. President, I intend to cast my vote to support the leadership of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in this crucial hour of my country's history. I do not know whether it will be a step toward war, I do not know whether it will bring war—I pray God it will not—but, regardless of the consequences, we must trust the President's leadership, we must strengthen his hand, we must pray that he have wisdom. It is not very important if one has wisdom unless he has it at the right time. The one who makes wisdom effective is the one who is wise at the right time. Our President has wisdom and courage; I pray God will give him strength. We must place our trust in Divine Providence and pray that—

He who, from zone to zone,

Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,

In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

Mr. President, for the safety and security of America, the resolution must pass.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2665) to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal-proportions method.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2665. An act to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal-proportions method;

H. R. 4599. An act to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for St. Elizabeths Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts; and

H. R. 5463. An act providing for the security of United States naval vessels, and for other purposes.

MODIFICATION OF NEUTRALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I shall not needlessly consume the time of the Senate. I ask only a few moments to raise my voice in protest against the suicide of my Republic.

A mountain of evidence has already been built which decries the pending proposals for the modification of the Neutrality Act—the only fiber of our foreign policy which safeguards our Nation's liberty.

There is hardly a Member of this body who supported the present Neutrality Act 2 years ago who did not then cry out that arming our merchant ships and sending them into belligerent zones meant war. Today this would not be a step short of war, but a leap which, it has been admitted here time and time again, would more than likely land us in the war.

To arm merchant ships with guns of the United States Army or Navy, and man them with United States soldiers or sailors with orders to "shoot on sight" and "shoot first," would be to send those ships to the war zones to wage war on the ships of Hitler.

Stripped of the circumlocution of legalistic phrases and of the devious ways of diplomacy, for this body to authorize such an act would be to sanction the conducting of undeclared war by the President. There is no authority anywhere in the Constitution or statutes or within the framework of our Government which authorizes the President to do this.

When I took my oath as a United States Senator to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, I did so with no mental reservation. I, for one, cannot permit myself to compromise that oath with any official, even be he the President himself, who seeks to practice evasion of our fundamental laws.

In the last World War the arming of American merchant ships by President Wilson led us into war with Germany within a few weeks after the step had been taken. It sent loyal American boys, ill-prepared to defend themselves, quickly to the scene of mortal danger. It will do that today, and when they lie in peaceless rest at the bottom of unknown oceans, their blood will be upon the heads of those who vote for this measure.

Everyone here who votes in support of the pending measure must be prepared to accept the further responsibility of accepting the challenge of war.

To pursue a course which admittedly means war requires that we have a cause for which to fight. And, more than all else, common prudence demands that we look well to our own welfare first and determine if we are ready for such an eventuality.

If the people knew the facts of our shocking unpreparedness, they would forbid the Congress to take any further

steps toward war until our domestic situation is straightened out.

For us to turn deaf ears to our own people's needs and to engage in helping those whom we only wish to call friend is to ignore the warning of the great leader of that great people whom we wish to help. For it was Winston Churchill who decried the honor of that nation which would place its safety "in hock" with the uncertain friendship of another power.

Let us take a lesson from the events current in our day. While Britain is using the respite gained by the heroic resistance of Russia against the Nazi government and building her own defenses, let us see that American defenses are strong and that America is fully protected before we engage in a course whose end is unpredictable in the so-called defense of our friends. It has long been the proud boast of Britain that "There will always be an England." Let us make sure there will always be an America.

There are very few, if any, Members of this body who are ready today to vote an all-out declaration of war against Germany. They do not believe that we have sufficient reason for such action.

The chief argument which has been repeated here over and over is that we must maintain our right of freedom of the seas. There never was such a thing as freedom of the seas in wartime. If Hitler should abolish all his bullying orders restricting freedom of the seas, we still would not have freedom of the seas as long as there was a single nation in the war.

I am against the foolish proposal which will lead our country to war, because you cannot fight a war with an army and navy "on order." If we place upon the splendid Navy we now have the burden of the patrol of the Atlantic, the maintaining of an adequate force in the Pacific, where Japan has already mobilized her sea forces, and the ever-present burden of the protection of the Panama Canal and the South American countries, we undertake a job for which we are wholly unprepared and which should be undertaken only in the last extremity of safety.

I am against the modification of the neutrality law because if we have any grievance with the Axis Powers, we have not exhausted the means for peaceful settlement.

There is in existence a solemn bilateral treaty between the United States and Germany, signed right here in Washington, ratified by this body on the 10th of May 1928, and ratified by Germany on the 28th of January 1929. According to that treaty, any disputes arising between the Government of the United States and the Government of Germany, of whatever nature they may be, when all other proceedings have failed, shall be submitted to a five-man commission. One member is to be selected by common German-American agreement, not a citizen of this country; one to represent each contracting nation and one to be named by each nation from a third country.

We should avail ourselves of the use of this treaty before we contend that we have exhausted every reasonable instrument for peace.

But it is said sneeringly, "You cannot do business with highwaymen." Well, if we cannot do business with highwaymen, why in the name of common sense do we still maintain an embassy in Berlin and give house to a German embassy in the United States. It is time that some order be established in our negotiations with the nations in this controversy, or that we break off all relations of every kind.

America does not want to be put in the class of nations which says that a treaty is only a scrap of paper to be violated when the observance is inconvenient to the Nation's self-interest. Let us keep America as at least one nation which respects its commitments and sets a standard of honor in its relations with other countries.

Then I must listen to the voice of the people of the land. The great majority of the people of America do not want to go to war. In Indiana that sentiment is almost unanimous, as I am sure will be confirmed by my able colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

That sentiment in Indiana is not because the people are not willing to make any sacrifice of blood and treasure that may be necessary to protect our Nation's honor or security. Indiana has always filled to the fullest its measure of devotion to our country's safety. The first life laid down in the last World War was that of an Indiana citizen. There can be no challenge to the patriotism and loyalty of these people opposing our entry into war.

They do not want to go to war, because they know that a democracy was never advanced by war. They know that most democracies have become decadent and have perished because of their entrance into war. The people of Indiana in overwhelming number are firmly convinced that entrance into this war would be the death knell of the Republic. For that reason I cannot abet the suicide of the Republic by voting for a measure which I believe would lead to war.

I am accepting the call of the people not because the great majority of them are opposed to entrance into the war; I am accepting the call because I believe that in times of crisis for our Nation, when our problems have been resolved through the medium of the common people, the right solution has been reached. I have faith that, in the last analysis, they are right.

Mr. President, since I have come to Washington the spot which has impressed me the most is not this imposing Capitol Building housing the heart of government. Nor is it that stately statue erected to the statesmanship of George Washington, first President of our country. Neither is it that magnificent memorial on the banks of the Potomac, which enshrines not only that wonderful likeness of Abraham Lincoln but also the saving philosophy of Lincoln engraved on its walls.

The place here which has made the deepest impression upon my soul is a little hidden hall bedroom down on Tenth Street across from the old Ford Theater. There on the blackest night in our Na-

tion's history they bore the dying body of our greatest American. There gathered around his bed not only the members of his family but those who had been nearest to him in the depressing days of his administration. Here were the men who came into the official circle to scoff and learned to praise. They had little faith in Lincoln at the beginning of his administration, but they came to trust him as a tower of strength as he brought the Nation out of the valley of the shadow of death.

One of those men who stood at that bedside through that saddest of April nights was Secretary Stanton, who had been most cruel and contemptuous in the early days of that administration, but when the last breath of life passed from President Lincoln, Mr. Stanton uttered those immortal words, "Now he belongs to the ages."

These men had come from doubt to faith, from criticism to confidence, from distrust to devotion, and they reached that faith, that confidence, and that devotion because they recognized that the fundamental, driving principle back of Abraham Lincoln was an abiding faith in the judgment of the common people.

Placing my faith in that same tribunal, I shall cast my vote against the modification of the neutrality law. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The Chair must admonish the occupants of the galleries demonstrations of approval or disapproval are not permitted under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, aware of the fact that the Senate does not want to listen any further, that there is no will to afford that patience which would permit a continued hearing for those who would be heard upon this all-important challenge, I am not one who would delay for longer than is absolutely necessary a decision upon the issue. I am aware of the fact that during this day serious effort is being made to accomplish such understanding as would permit a decision upon the issue before the day is ended, and because of a desire to cooperate in that effort I shall do my utmost to confine what remarks I wish to make upon the subject within an hour, if I possibly can. To accomplish that I shall of necessity have to ignore such requests as may be made to yield to other Senators unless it be strictly and alone for a question.

Mr. President, if Congress enacts this repealer of virtually all that remains of law fortifying our chance to keep out of war, then we of Congress have naught to do but acknowledge finally the fact that our separate steps up to war, including this pending repeal of neutrality features, had brought us into the war. It will be no valid excuse then for Congress to whine that it had taken those steps because the President had said the steps would keep us out of war. If the pending proposed grant of authority to the President to arm our ships and send them into the war zones and into belligerent ports is enacted, let every Member of Congress who supports the pro-

posal count himself responsible for what is certain to follow.

We have all declared at one time or another that we are unalterably opposed to engaging our country in a shooting war. But when we support this repeal resolution we actually vote authority to the President to shoot our way into the shooting war.

The President requests this course of action by Congress after he has already ordered the Navy to shoot on sight. Congress seems about to accept the course the President has chosen. Yet Congress professes determination to keep America out of the war when it knows it is giving authority by its vote now to push us into the war. How like April 7, 1917, are these hours!

I read from an editorial of April 3, 1917, appearing in a Portland, Oreg., newspaper:

Congress will undoubtedly accept the course the President has chosen. The American Navy, as indicated in the President's message to Congress, will be used to keep the sea lanes clear. All the ingenuity and all the resources of the United States will be employed to rid the seas of the submarine. Money and credits will be supplied in full measure to the Entente. Most of all, munitions, provisions, and equipment will be forwarded in more liberal measure than ever to the Entente armies on the western front. No American army of importance will be sent to France. There are not ships enough available to transport a force of any consequence or to provision such a force after it was landed in Europe. Beyond the sending of a small force of regulars for sentimental reasons, we are not likely to make land forces a part of our contribution to the conflict.

It is the money and the munitions and the food furnished Germany's antagonists that will contribute most to the embarrassment of the Hohenzollern dynasty.

Remembering the picture of that period, on April 3, 1917, we had not yet declared war. We were only going to take a few steps, most innocent, to accomplish certain fine purposes; but there would be no A. E. F. This Oregon editor was innocent, as Congress professes to be innocent in this hour, of the consequences of a vote favorable to the ordering of our armed ships into submarine and mine-infested waters abroad. Perhaps history will be kind to such preposterous innocence.

What is presented for the determination of Congress is simply the privilege of shooting our way into a shooting war; and there are those who are thoroughly disgusted, or at least disappointed, because there is no unity upon a prospect so obvious as this one. If there were to be an open approach to what is being accomplished, then there would be laid before us a proposal for a declaration of war, with Congress asked to pass upon it; and after Congress had passed upon it, if a declaration of war were voted, we could have as much unity as this country can possibly afford under existing circumstances. But there cannot be unity, and there will not be unity, in these steps straight into war so long as they are professedly steps intended to avoid our involvement in war.

We have gone through some serious incidents in recent weeks. First came the Greer incident; then the orders of

the President to shoot on sight; then the *Kearny* incident; and then the fate that befell the *Reuben James*. I have wondered, as we have moved through these days, about the foresight of that Member among us who at one time many months ago spoke of a policy and a program to plow under a proportion of American sons.

Following the incidents of which I have spoken, a plea was made to the American people by none less than the President himself. He pleaded with those whose sons had gone down on the *Reuben James* or as a result of the tragedy of the *Kearny* to get into harmony with the spirit of the hour, meaning the war spirit. Many persons have followed that pleading; many have been made to see that American sons having given their lives to this cause thus far, it must be acknowledged that the war is really ours.

But what of the boys themselves, Mr. President? What of their fathers and mothers? What are they thinking? I have been eager to know. Two or three evenings ago, following a radio broadcast in which I declared, as others have declared, that the responsibility for those deaths was alone upon the hands of the President of the United States, I received a telephone call from the father of one of the boys who had perished when the *Reuben James* was sunk. I have never heard upon wires of communication such pleading and such bitterness of heart as I heard then, as this man was pleading for other men's sons and urging whatever action might be taken in Congress to put a stop to the business of giving to others, in the name of defense, all we have that is worth while and sending forth our sons in unrepaid, unready ships such as the *Reuben James*.

Mr. President, deception and misstatement have been the motive behind this mad rush of ours for far too many weeks. To point to misrepresentation of more recent date, I refer to a newspaper report of November 4, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, quoting Mrs. Roosevelt as saying that ship losses show the United States peril. She is quoted in that dispatch as having said, in speaking of the *Reuben James* incident:

I think it will make more people realize that if we are defending our shores up to a certain point, we run certain dangers, and that we get the consequences of running those dangers.

Here we have a deliberate misstatement of facts, for the *Reuben James* was not "defending our shores up to a certain point," but was engaged in a service which is in direct conflict with the existing neutrality law, and the sinking had about as much to do with the defense of our shores as the sinking of a freighter by an iceberg.

The point raised by Mrs. Roosevelt does not involve the wisdom or the necessity of going to war with Germany. Our interests may demand such action; but the big issue in regard to her statement is that it is not true. Big issues such as this sinking should be clearly stated with facts so that they will be clearly understood by everybody. Otherwise, emotion rather than reason will govern the mass thinking of the people, as it has largely

governed the mass thinking in America today. We are confronted very definitely with deception, which the World-Telegram, of New York, refers to as the "whiskers," and demands the removal of "the false whiskers" from this issue, declaring that:

Before the Senate neutrality vote the administration should take the false whiskers off its "partial repeal" resolution.

Every Member of Congress knows this is a vote on undeclared naval and air war. But the public does not know.

The public has been fooled so often about this war business that there is going to be a bitter reaction some day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Last Call for Congress" may be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram of Tuesday, November 4, 1941]

LAST CALL FOR CONGRESS

Before the Senate neutrality vote the administration should take the false whiskers off its partial-repeal resolution.

Every Member of Congress knows this is a vote on undeclared naval and air war. But the public does not know.

The public has been fooled so often about this war business that there is going to be a bitter reaction some day.

So far not one major decision on this issue has been frank. The Neutrality Act was first amended in 1939, on the administration's plea that this would prevent involvement. Lend-lease was passed with the same pledge, plus a commitment against delivery and convoys. Even as recently as the House vote on arming merchantmen the administration feared to include repeal of the ban on American deliveries to belligerent ports through combat zones—a step toward frankness that has now been forced in the Senate by Republican interventionists.

The honest way to vote on the President's blank check for undeclared war is by a straight repeal resolution. And the honest way to vote on all-out intervention is by a declaration-of-war resolution.

This is the last call so far as Congress is concerned. The United States already is part way in a shooting war by Presidential order, without congressional consent—far enough in that many Members opposing intervention think the President, by an accomplished fact, has destroyed Congress' constitutional power of choice. Certainly this would be true if the area of undeclared naval combat were widened. After that, no congressional vote could undo the fact of war.

Now Congress must decide whether we are going in; and if so whether we shall try to limit it to a naval and air war, or prepare an American expeditionary force. The American people have a right to know.

In our judgment, repeal of the neutrality law and extension of the naval-air war—to say nothing of an American expeditionary force—would be folly. For reasons eloquently stated by the President in the campaign, we think the United States can be more effective as an arsenal for the Allies than as a belligerent arming itself. The increasing threat of Pacific war, if nothing else, should prevent our walking into Hitler's trap of a two-ocean war with a one-ocean navy.

But whether the United States goes to war or stays out, the essential thing is that a clear constitutional decision be made in such a way as to strengthen our democracy and to cement our national unity. That cannot be achieved by a craven Congress, passing a

phony resolution, abdicating its constitutional responsibility to decide peace or war. Last call for Congress!

Mr. NYE. Is there anyone who can doubt that by this action, if we take it, we of Congress will be definitely vacating our own powers as representatives of the people?

The Wall Street Journal, under a heading Peace or War, writes this editorial:

We believe that if Congress authorizes the arming of merchant ships, without at the same time considering the implications of its action, the effect will be that it has vacated its own constitutional power to declare war. We believe that it will have given another branch of the Government a power of action where a complete shooting war will be inevitable. Another of the world's legislatures will have surrendered.

So it seems to us past time that our foreign policy be laid before the people, not in pieces like a jig-saw puzzle, but as a full picture.

Let us have a full congressional discussion of war and its implications. Let us consider the lives that will be lost, the treasure that will be spent, and what we must do and where we must go to achieve a victory.

Let us also discuss the necessity for war and the alternatives to war.

We have expressed our hope as to what the decision will be. But if it is otherwise than we hope, we will know that it has been arrived at by the process of American democracy.

The full acceptance of such a decision is a duty.

Most heartily do I agree that to be the duty at this time confronting the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, obviously it is war that we are about to vote for. Why disguise it? Why run away from the fact? Why run away from so obvious a thing as the consequences which must follow upon the heels of the authorization which the pending legislation, if enacted, would grant to the President of the United States?

H. Bond Bliss, writer of a daily column in the Miami Herald, puts it well when he says:

War. It begins to come home. Now American ships are sunk, American lives are lost. Blood is being shed. It is no longer short of war. So the interventionists, safely inside the ramparts, should rejoice. They have won. Lights are going out in America, as they went out in Europe. This Nation enters the insane asylum voluntarily. We shall save democracy by destroying it; we shall end war by waging it. It is a very solemn occasion. Historians of the future will wonder how a great and free country was for the second time dragged into the bloody chaos of the impossible Europe—against the will of the silent people.

Torpedoed was the American destroyer *Reuben James*, carrying 120 officers and men. This fateful event occurred in Iceland waters while the vessel was engaged in convoy duty, participating in the shooting war personally declared by President Roosevelt without consulting the Congress of the United States. The American Navy loses its first warship. But there will be others.

Comment. President Roosevelt said it did not change the international situation from the American viewpoint. No; we are at war. Knew nothing about breaking diplomatic relations. Americans and Germans are shooting each other but they may continue to meet and talk in Washington. It is a pleasant arrangement—except for the boys who die.

In concluding his column for that day, Mr. Bliss had this to say:

Lights are actually going out. Blacked are decorative lighting signs and other nonessentials in Southeastern States where electricity must be conserved for defense industries. The dark is good. It hides so much.

How much it hides, Mr. President, we shall better know, perhaps, another day than now; but that it is hiding much we must concede.

Darkness of deception and of misstatement, of hate and of fear and of fiction, governs for the moment our shameful change of mind and the quickness with which we are ready to grasp at anything which would seem to excuse our actions of the moment. It was only, it seems now, a matter of a few weeks ago when the cry across this land, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, led by American leadership, was, "Come! Save France." Then a little later it was, "Come! Save Greece." Our hearts were in the cause of the people of France and of Greece. But today the same leadership and many of the same persons who shared the wish to aid France and to aid Greece, are wholly tolerant and cooperative with the policy which finds us, in cooperation with Great Britain, starving Greece and starving France, and finding excuses for doing so.

It seems only a matter of days ago, Mr. President, when all over this land the praises were being sung of that courageous little land, Finland, and its fine people—our kind of people. We respected them, we honored them, we praised them in all quarters. Within the last few hours the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, has notified Finland that if she does not stop her present fighting she will, in effect, find herself the enemy of the United States and will fall from the good graces of the United States. What has occasioned this fall from our so-called good graces? Nothing more, Mr. President, than that Finland has reached out and availed herself of the only club at hand to be used in rewinning the sovereignty she lost only a few months ago to Joe Stalin and Russia. That is the sum total of reason, of cause, for our attitude and our action today against Finland.

Not long ago was the hour when we shuddered and feared that vulturelike thing which rested back there in the shadows of Europe, that thing which seemed to be waiting for Europe to waste herself to decay so that it might move in and thrive, as it thrives only upon destruction and upon despair. How we feared that vulture, Russia; how we hated those who had persecuted and crucified religion. How we detested those murderers, guilty of more manner of crimes than civilization ever dreamed could possibly be committed in its present day. But today we are doing all we can to accomplish delivery of aid to the people of Russia; and today many of those who bundled for Britain and shuddered in contemplation of what communism in Russia would mean to the world are bundling for Russia.

Mr. President, these things could not have been accomplished without deception, without misstatement, without re-

sort to hate and to fear and to the fiction to which we have been so largely subjected of late months. Indeed, darkness is good at times, especially in times such as these, when we find these great inconsistencies in our changed thinking overnight. I suppose there is no more reason why Americans should not change their minds abruptly than that Britons should change their minds almost overnight. Today we receive in America the Beaverbrooks, as we once received Lord Lothian, and we listen to every word Winston Churchill may say, because everything such British statesmen may do and say is directed to the fanning of our hates and fears. But when these men were free from the pressure and from the force that is directed against them now, they were talking quite another language. Today they would have us feel and know what I am inclined to agree with, namely, that the world faces nothing more challenging than Hitlerism at the present time, but it was only a short time ago that these Britons were praising the same identical Hitlerism.

On October 31, 1938, Lord Beaverbrook, the same Lord Beaverbrook who wants us now to hate and to believe that our very life as a nation is dependent upon the destruction of Hitler, said:

We certainly credit Hitler with honesty and sincerity. We believe in his purpose, stated over and over again, to seek an accommodation with us, and we accept to the full the implications of the Munich document.

Lord Rothemere, he who would have us believe that we cannot do business with Hitler and cannot even think of tolerating those who would undertake to do business with Hitler—in 1938 Lord Rothemere said:

There is no man living whose promise given in regard to something of real moment I would sooner take—

Meaning than Hitler's—

He is simple, unaffected, and obviously sincere. He is supremely intelligent.

But in a matter of 2 years—indeed, less than that—there came the changed thinking which these men have been telling to us in season and out of season ever since. We all know the part Lord Lothian played when he was here in developing these hates and fears. Yet the same Lord Lothian in 1938 was saying concerning the causes of the trouble in Europe:

We are largely responsible for the situation that confronts us today.

"We" meaning Great Britain.

If another war comes and the history of it is ever written, the dispassionate historian a hundred years hence will not say that Germany alone is responsible for it, even if she strikes the first blow, but that those who mismanaged the world between 1918 and 1937 had a large share of responsibility for it.

Now, Mr. President, while we are being urged to destroy this man Hitler, with no one urging it more powerfully than Winston Churchill, it is most interesting to look ahead and anticipate what might happen in certain eventualities in Europe according to Mr. Churchill's own defining. In 1938 Mr. Churchill was saying this:

I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations.

That was only in November 1938 Mr. President. In 1934 Mr. Churchill was saying:

We must be safe from undue foreign pressure. * * * We cannot confide the safety of our country to the passions or the panic of any foreign nation which may be facing some desperate crisis. * * * All history has proved the peril of being dependent upon a foreign state for home defense instead of upon one's own right arm.

The same Churchill who today is preaching to Americans, "You must get into this fight; it is your war we are fighting," gave us notice in 1934 that if we were in Britain's shoes and Britain were in our shoes we would have no right to look to Britain for any aid in an hour such as this.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Senator's attention been called to the President's speech of yesterday to the delegates to the International Labor Organization conference?

Mr. NYE. I have not read the speech; I heard some discussion concerning it this morning.

Mr. WALSH. May I read two sentences from that address?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. I quote from the President's speech of yesterday:

The American people have made an unlimited commitment that there shall be a free world. Against that commitment no individual or group shall prevail.

I ask the Senator to note the language, "An unlimited commitment that there shall be a free world." If that means anything, it means that our Army, our Navy, our resources, and our lives are committed unlimitedly to free the world. Furthermore, if it means what it appears to mean from the use of the word "shall," we are going to be committed indefinitely to the task of bringing freedom to the world. I ask the Senator, Does he know whether anybody but the President of the United States has been consulted in reference to any such commitment?

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Massachusetts knows, as I feel I know, that there has been no consultation that has brought about any such unlimited commitment as the President has proclaimed exists. "Commitments," Mr. President! We have been told again and again and again in respect to our relations with foreign countries that there have been no commitments of which we of the Congress and the people of the United States were not aware. Time and time again has that assurance been given. Now comes the word from the lips of the President himself that we are committed to the accomplishment of a free world.

I am obliged to the Senator from Massachusetts for calling my attention to that, because the expression of the President plus the important proposal before us, leaves nothing, Mr. President, to the imagination. We ought now to be ready to acknowledge that going through with the proposal before us means war. We lay in the lap and place in the hands of the President of the United States himself every claim that we in the Congress have in the way of control over the question of going to war.

There need be no doubt about the import of this immediate proposal. There have been doubts concerning the previous steps and the law violations that have been practiced. But every time the doubt has been decided in favor of the President. In the case of his quarantine speech, the people decided the doubt in his favor and said, "Well, perhaps he knows, and perhaps this is a thing that will increase our chance to avoid involvement in war." When it came time for Congress to be asked to repeal the arms embargo, the President gave double assurance that it did not mean war, that it meant the opposite; it meant prevention of involvement in war.

In his message to Congress on September 21, 1939, the President said:

I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict. * * *

I believe that American merchant vessels should, so far as possible, be restricted from entering danger zones.

Mr. President, there was an assurance, a broad assurance, an assurance that the American people and the Congress were ready to accept. That was a thing that was going to help us keep out of war—this assurance by the same President who has not even waited for authorization to move American merchant ships into the danger zones.

When conscription came, it came in the name of helping us keep out of war—conscribing first for 12 and then for 30 months young men for military service and training, at a time when even nations at war were conscripting for a like purpose for a period of only 4 months, as was true in the case of Canada.

Again, lend-lease was accomplished in the name of helping us keep out of war, and the decision of the people there was one in favor of the President's own declared conclusions.

Then, in part at least, we were told, in connection with the \$13,000,000,000 of appropriations to implement the lend-lease program, that there, too, was assurance—large assurance—of our ability to keep out of the war.

And when, without authorization or warning, the President moved American boys into Iceland, outside of this hemisphere, again the people settled the doubt that was in their minds and considered that perhaps these things were in the interest of keeping America out of war.

All these things were accomplished by this kind of assurance; but there is not going to be, in American thinking, any

doubt decided in favor of the President on what the pending challenge really means to the people of the United States. There is not any doubting the meaning of his orders to "shoot on sight." There is not any doubt concerning the incidents that befell the *Greer*, the *Kearny*, and the *Reuben James*; and there is not going to be any doubt concerning the purport, whatever it may be called, of the repealer resolution which is now pending here. The challenge now, and the people know it, is war; and no Member of Congress is going to be able satisfactorily to explain to the people of America that this step is anything other than one immediately inviting American involvement in a much larger way in this war.

No one doubts that public sentiment in the United States is very definitely adverse to added involvement by our country. No one seriously disputes it. For my own part I think, were the issue of war or peace clearly and definitely put to the American people, we should find at least 90 percent of them determined against involvement in it; and here we are immediately challenged with the possibility—though it may be by only one or two votes, the possibility, nevertheless—of the Senate letting the country be moved into an undeclared war.

Mr. President, I shall not disguise the fact that I am angry, as others are angry. I have fullest respect for every mind in this Chamber. To them goes the right which I ask to have—the right to speak what they think, and to speak as they will. But, however highly I respect others, I cannot be other than angered when I observe how we have been taken inch by inch, by deception and by misstatement, to the very precipice upon which we find ourselves at this moment. I am angry when I see how easy is the spending of money that we do not have, of credit that belongs to generations yet unborn. It angers me to know that it is approximately true that from 1789 down to 1933 the total expenditures of the Federal Government were \$71,000,000,000, whereas the expenditures and authorizations from 1933 down to the present hour total more than that, approximately \$75,000,000,000—more in 9 years than was true in the preceding 144 years. And yet there is a feeling of resignation that somehow—no one knows just how, but somehow—we shall find our way out of it, and add to these costs the costs that will accrue if we go the full route and involve ourselves in the thing which I believe is going to destroy every civilization that lets its hand touch it; and we shall have an accumulation of billions of debt that will do something more than stagger the American imagination.

I have been angered to see how easily, for a few minutes at least, Americans were ready to accept the thought that we were launching upon a program that was surely going to accomplish for all the world, in our time and our generation, freedoms that not even some Americans in our own time and generation could hope to enjoy.

I have been angered by what I have observed to be the almost complete surrender of the legislative branch of the Government to the executive branch.

I am angered when I see the economy of my country being thoroughly wrecked and disrupted, while over in Great Britain manufacturers there, profiting by our priorities program here in the United States and profiting by our lend-lease aid, are taking our American steel, molding it into the machines that they sell back to us in America and sell to the South American republics, and holding their own trade channels while America is abandoning all, or practically all, of her trade channels.

It angers me to see the American people made to pay more for food than is being paid in Great Britain for food that is being shipped from America, and paid for with lend-lease American dollars.

These things do anger me, and yet I have not let the anger become a hatred. I have not let it become an obsession, because somehow I am made to feel that we are going to win this cause of saving America from destruction. I think it was Herbert Hoover who said that God has been awfully good to children, and to drunks. Knowing how childish we have been in some respects, knowing how drunk we have become upon misinformation, I still have hope that perhaps we can yet be saved.

But look, Mr. President, for just a moment. Look to the things that we have been caused to fear. There is the fear of dependence on our part upon the British Navy; fear that Britain is our first line of defense. Once it was France—in which event, then, our first line of defense has long since been abandoned. Then there is the expressed fear of invasion, and the fear that we may, in certain eventualities abroad, lose all our foreign trade. Then there is the fear and the hatred of aggressor nations; and then there is the fear, planted by Americans, that if we do not help accomplish the defeat of certain causes in Europe, an American insurance policy will not be worth the paper it is written upon.

Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, having spent a great deal of time in preparing briefs upon this subject in anticipation of this address to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks of today the briefs referred to may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the fears of which I have been speaking briefly, to which I refer at greater length in the briefs which have just been received for the Record, have been engineered by propaganda pure and simple, some of it emanating from abroad, most of it engineered and carried on right here at home.

Following the last war, Lord Northcliffe was good enough to reveal for the benefit and knowledge of Americans that during the course of our neutrality days of 1914, 1915, and 1916 Great Britain had spent \$156,000,000 to accomplish the entry of the United States into that war of Great Britain's. I am not so foolish as to believe that there is not some such amount of money being spent in the

United States these days to accomplish our involvement in the present war.

We know that in times past Britons, including Winston Churchill, have expressed themselves as appreciating what could be accomplished if only they could get some American blood spilled, what a large part that would play in causing America finally to take part in Europe's war.

These fears, engineered by propaganda, have accomplished unbelievable things in American thinking. I shall not say more about the issue of propaganda, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks a statement which I have prepared upon the issue of propaganda.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

MR. NYE. Mr. President, propaganda in a word, has accomplished an almost complete alteration of our course in America and of our policy. It seems only yesterday that, after our last war experience in Europe, the front pages all over the land were like the one I have in my hand, a reproduction of the front page of the Chicago American of November 11, 1918. What a joyous story that front page carried to the American people:

"Fight has stopped. America's aims accomplished," says Wilson.

So goes the story, with words from Marshal Foch, with words from France concerning the ending of that awful thing which had beset the world, starting in 1914. And from that day on there came the evidence which caused Americans almost unanimously to vow that never, never, never again would we permit this land of ours to be involved in war as it was in 1917 and 1918.

What we saw after the Armistice Day, the anniversary of which we shall be celebrating in 3 or 4 days, was that, though we had gone forth to attain great and noble objectives we had lost everything for which we had said we were fighting. We felt the burden of the cost, we saw the mounting debt which involvement in that war was bringing. We felt, as the years moved on, the seriousness of the depression which the changed economy occasioned by that war had brought to American business and to American individuals, and we said, "Never again."

Then from year to year we looked into the commanding buildings called veterans' hospitals, and saw there reminders of what war could do to a nation. We felt and we saw at every crossroads in America heartbreak and broken homes, and we swore, "Never again."

Then we listened to those who had been our Allies referring to us constantly and continuously as "Uncle Shylock," and we said, "Never again."

But I do not think anything entered more largely into American resolution than did the attitude of our Allies, the Britons primarily, some of them active in the cause of their country, when they resorted to the story, and repeated it again and again and again, that "We could have won the war without you Americans. You did not do your part in it."

No one knows better than do the Britons that during the closing days of that war far more American sons than British sons were fighting in France.

As we weighed all that and more, the determination of the American people to see that it never happened again mounted; it grew to be a great force in American thinking, a force which was felt so powerfully here in Congress that Congress set itself to the writing of whatever manner of law might be written in order to prevent our easy involvement in another foreign struggle, and the neutrality laws resulted.

We need not here declare what the purpose of those laws was. Everyone knows their purpose. The purpose was served by acknowledgment of the fears which had been the greatest force in dragging us into the last war. Those laws were passed by Congress by very nearly unanimous votes in both Houses. They were cheered from one end of the land to the other. But no one cheered louder, no one gave greater lip service and praise to those laws of neutrality, than did the President of the United States.

The laws had not been on the books long before the coming of the 1936 Presidential campaign, and during the course of that campaign, in the much-referred-to Chautauqua speech, the President portrayed how the little steps had been responsible for getting us into the last war. It must not happen again, he said. He spoke of the Congress, through the neutrality laws, having fortified the country's ability to avoid involvement in war.

Then he said—I am not trying to quote his words exactly, but I think I am not misstating at all—that when trouble came to Europe there would be selfish, greedy ones in America, bent upon getting the fool's gold which was available out of other peoples' wars, who would want the neutrality laws repealed, set aside, ignored. But, said the President, if ever the choice should again be ours as between peace and profit, America must, America would, choose peace.

I think history will record that there never was delivered in all American political history a more influential campaign speech than the one at Chautauqua. It sewed up the decision days before the election, for it was in that hour that Americans were hearing the roll of the drums in Europe again, and wondering whether it meant the sacrifice of more American sons. Our citizenship sought nothing in that campaign so much as assurance from would-be leaders that America would not be involved in the war; and here was a man telling the people what would happen if selfish ones came and tried to get rid of this fortification against war, the laws of neutrality.

Immediately following that campaign and the recording of the result, and the swearing in of a new Congress, there came complete fulfillment of the President's prediction. There came to Congress those seeking repeal of the arms-embargo feature of the neutrality law, and the one fulfilling the prophecy as to those who would be after fool's gold, the No. 1 operator, was President Roosevelt himself, asking for repeal of the arms

embargo, and, of course, doing it in the name of keeping us out of war, as every step after that was taken in the name of keeping us out of war.

Step by step, Mr. President, we have gone down the road to war. Propaganda has changed innumerable minds, presumably strong minds.

Today, with regularity, in newspaper columns and over the air waves, comes a voice preaching no word of warning, no word of caution, no word looking to a possible collectiveness and coolness on the part of the American people. Quite the contrary, that voice today would have us understand that we ought to be much further involved in this thing than we are. I am speaking of Walter Winchell. Walter Winchell stood his ground against this propaganda for a long while. He stood his ground and was standing it splendidly in 1939 when he wrote lines that are just as true today as they were on the day they were spoken. Hear him, Mr. President:

Once again Europe is rolling the loaded dice of destiny. And once again America is asked to play the role of international sucker. The time has come for us to pause and consider. If we must have another Unknown Soldier, let us not ask him to die for an unknown reason. And just what will be accomplished by dying in the mud? He will not increase America's resources; the last war nearly ruined our fertile lands. He will not increase America's wealth; in the last war we loaned our gold and were gold-bricked in return. America must learn that her sons abroad will bring monuments to her glory, but her sons at home are a monument to her common sense. The future of American youth is on top of American soil—not underneath European dirt.

Mr. President, one must be impressed by the tremendous change that has come into the thinking and the acting of men since that hour in 1939. Perhaps some day we shall know what has played a part in that sort of consideration. We were asked originally simply to permit the arming of merchantmen. That proposal has been amended by the Senate committee under, I should say, rather distressing circumstances, without a chance for the American people to be heard; it has been amended to provide also for the dispatch of our armed ships into the war zones and even into belligerent ports. Originally the request was merely for the arming of merchantmen. I dare say that if we should refuse to grant that authority we would find that many American merchantmen have already been armed without authority, in defiance of Congress.

I have before me a letter dated October 30, from Baltimore, saying:

It may interest you to know that while you are debating whether our ships should be armed there lies in Baltimore Harbor the *Cold Harbor*, an American ship (which was recently the Red Cross relief ship), armed and ready to sail.

The *Cold Harbor* is not a war vessel but a freighter, and the gun is plainly visible.

Mr. President, I spoke of how fear and fiction had taken in millions upon millions of Americans. Two men met on a boat one day and translated this fear and this fiction into causes, including the cause of winning the freedom of the seas.

I shall not repeat what I said the other day, except to remark that there is no such thought in the mind of Great Britain as the granting of freedom of the seas in the sense in which we consider freedom of the seas. They had their opportunity to enjoy freedom of the seas back in 1918 and 1919, but they would not accept it, they would not have anything to do with it. They insulted the President of the United States as they denied him a chance for his issue of freedom of the seas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been trying by conferences to arrange an agreement with respect to the limitation on debate, and I think that a solution has been arrived at which will be satisfactory to everyone.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 5 o'clock p. m. today and during the further consideration of the pending measure, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not want to interfere with a speedy vote by this body on the question; but after much consideration I have prepared a statement of my position, which it will take me about an hour, or perhaps an hour and 15 minutes, to present. My statement is about 40 pages long, widely spaced. I do not wish to delay matters, but I do not desire to be foreclosed the opportunity to make that speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that the Senator from Maryland would follow the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I shall not take more than 15 or 20 minutes longer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I understand the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is to speak, and that I shall follow him, and if the Senator from Florida does not speak long, and I shall have time to deliver my speech, I shall be glad to enter into the proposed agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator will recall, in trying to arrange this program today it was agreed that the Senator from Maryland was to follow the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

Mr. TYDINGS. That suits me perfectly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel that arrangement ought to be carried out. I think there will be plenty of time for Senators to speak. I have not spoken, and I feel that I should say something before the vote, but I am willing to forego any remarks whatever on this matter in order to get a vote. If I cannot have the opportunity of speaking before the 5 o'clock limitation, I shall take my chances with the 20 minutes allowed. I think we shall be able to accommodate everyone.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not object, because I shall enter into the spirit of the occasion, and if unforeseen circumstances should arise, I will rely on the good faith of my friend the Senator from

Kentucky to see that I have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what has been said conforms to my wishes. I wish to add to the Senator from Maryland that it was understood that he was to follow the Senator from North Dakota. I think he will be given ample time to make his remarks before the limitation on debate begins at 5 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield further—

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the information of the Senate I wish to announce that in view of the agreement, the Senate will continue in session and not adjourn today until we have had a vote.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, when I yielded to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for the unanimous-consent arrangement, I was speaking of how we had been denied the accomplishment of things for which we had fought by those with whom we had allied ourselves to the end that we might win those things—freedom of the seas, for example. If again men in high places shall tell us that if we will simply do our part now we can have freedom of the seas when the present international mess shall have been cleared up. I shall be reminded only of the warning so oft repeated, the warning of the Indian who said "White man fool Indian once. Shame on white man. White man fool Indian twice. Shame on Indian." So it is with us Americans. If we are going to lend ourselves to being fooled again as completely as we have been fooled heretofore, the shame will not be upon Great Britain for striving to get us into this war—the shame will be upon us of 1941, and especially us here in the Senate who hold within our hands the opportunity now to change the course and to deny the continuing direction which is bound to have us involved ultimately.

These things could be avoided if we would give truth a little larger chance in America than it has had in a great many months. To my way of thinking, in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, the causes confronting the world and the causes confronting Europe today are the same identical causes that have had one generation after another of Europeans involved in war—causes not at all unlike those which involved the world, including ourselves, not quite 25 years ago.

Mr. President, is it unfair, when we go searching for what might be the fundamental cause of Europe's trouble today, to resort to such authority as David Lloyd George, speaking even after his country had declared war against Germany? I insist that the address delivered in Parliament by David Lloyd George on May 9, 1940, may be referred to again in the Senate as a pretty fine

statement of what probably are the underlying causes. Said David Lloyd George in that address on that day:

The Treaty of Versailles was not carried out by those who dictated it. A good deal of the trouble was due to that fact. We were dealing with governments in Germany which were democratic governments, based on a democratic franchise, with democratic statesmen, and it is because we did not carry out the undertaking we had given to those democratic governments that Hitler came into power. There was a good deal that was done in Germany, more particularly with regard to disarmament. The solid promise that we gave, not merely in the treaty itself, but in a document which I took part in drafting, which was signed by M. Clemenceau on our behalf, that if Germany disarmed, we should immediately follow her example, was not carried out, and there is no government that is more responsible for that than the present national government which came into power in 1931. They had their opportunity. America was ready, Germany was ready—it was a time when Herr Bruening was in charge—but we refused to carry out the terms after Germany had been completely disarmed. We had the certificate of the ambassadors to say that disarmament was completed, but in spite of that, we did not carry out our part.

The Prime Minister of the World War days further stated in this speech in Parliament:

I urged the conquering powers, who were then all powerful, to exert their authority to compel these countries to carry out the pledges which they had given. I pointed out over and over again that if they did not do so it would end in a great European war and that there would be trouble. My predictions, unfortunately, have turned out to be true, and when the history of the whole of these transactions come to be written, if the honorable gentleman will take the trouble to read it, he will find that most of this trouble has originated in the fact that the victors in the late war did not carry out solemn pledges which they gave in a treaty which they themselves dictated. They had the opportunity. Germany was prostrate. The creation of this terrible power in Germany, the spirit which is behind it, and what makes it so formidable at the present moment is due to the fact that we did not carry out our pledges.

Mr. President, whose war is it, therefore, under the acknowledged circumstances? Definitely it is not ours. It is the war of those who did not know how to treat a peace; and, unfortunately, there have been few victors in Europe who have known how to treat a peace in a way that would accomplish anything resembling an enduring peace.

Mr. President, so long as we keep upon the statute books laws forbidding the arming of merchantmen, forbidding American vessels in war zones, and forbidding American vessels in the ports of belligerent nations, we have some power left in Congress to help this country to keep out of war. The Boston Post expresses it splendidly when it says:

It is going to be hard to explain to the American public why the Neutrality Act has to be repealed.

It certainly removed a lot of causes for war right up to and including the present moment. As long as it was active and observed, the overt acts which bring on war were pushed into the distance so far that the most rabid war promoters were disappointed.

It and considerations of air and naval defense caused the long stride that the United States took toward the east.

If we add up causes of this embroilment in the European war, we can see that if the Neutrality Act was observed and is observed in the future, there is little chance of the overt act happening.

It is only the strategic considerations which are being invoked up to the present, and we all are fairly well aware of them.

For example, as soon as the war broke out and the submarine warfare started, many ships were transferred to Panamanian registry by private concerns.

The act was passed to keep American ships out of the war zones so that the debacle of 1917 would not be repeated.

But now, what is the purpose of repealing the act and sending our duly registered ships into the war zones?

It surely cannot be that the promoters of war want a loss of life and property to egg on public feeling.

That is not necessary at this time. Under the present system of shooting war, ordered by the President, we can have merchant ships, naval vessels, and aircraft destroyed on the high road to Iceland in quantities big enough to satisfy the most bloodthirsty minds in America.

We are making up convoys and will probably reach a fighting decision with Germany's submarines in a short while.

These actions pay no attention to the spirit or the word of the Neutrality Act and in effect nullify it. Yet as long as it remains on the books the public knows that the Congress has not been consulted or permitted to make a decision in the matter. And it is through Congress that the public expresses itself.

It is true that peace has flown out of the window and we are committed to the defeat of Hitler and his forces.

And it is also true that there is something ostrichlike in keeping the neutrality law, as a safeguard to peace, while the shooting war booms all around the eastern Atlantic.

But as long as it remains on the books the Congress still holds a moral, if not physical, grip on the destinies of the Nation.

Precisely, Mr. President. If Congress wants to surrender whatever grip it has left upon the destinies of this Nation, it needs only to pass the resolution which is pending at the present time, for by so doing we shall place in the hands of the President, and the President alone, our destiny.

Today I heard on the floor of the Senate a splendid portrayal of what had been the contributions of him whom we respect, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the contributions of Virginia itself. In this present controversy I should like to point a finger to at least a part of Virginia where, in an election the other day, with the issue drawn on the question of foreign policy, a Republican—of all things—in Fairfax County was elected to the Congress of the United States. There appears in this morning's Times-Herald an article by Frank C. Waldrop entitled "Test Case," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of November 7, 1941]

TEST CASE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

We have had an interesting little test case over in Fairfax County, Va., on whether the

public wants its elected representatives to be world savers or minders of home business.

In this instance we have the case of Col. Richard Farr, running as a Republican, versus Francis Pickens Miller, a Democrat, in the contest for the Fairfax County seat in the Virginia House of Delegates.

Colonel Farr won by 1,588 votes to 1,399.

Fairfax County is not Republican. Indeed, Colonel Farr frankly admits "naturally, it was the Democrats who elected me, and I'm going to thank them, too."

Now, why did this happen?

Francis Pickens Miller, according to the 1940-41 edition of Who's Who, was born at Middlesborough, Ky., June 5, 1895, and got his bachelor of arts degree from Washington and Lee University. Then he went over to England and got his master of arts degree from Oxford University, which he attended as a Rhodes scholar. From there he went on to Geneva to work at the Graduate Institute of International Studies. He was in the American Expeditionary Force (2 years), rising from private to first lieutenant, and since the first World War has busied himself with matters of great international moment.

He is a member of the board of visitors and governors of St. John's College at Annapolis and has been in the Virginia House of Delegates since 1938.

Until now.

Mr. Miller is an all-around busy man, for he happens to be not only all the foregoing but also one of the prime movers and central organizers of the campaign to put America into this European war. He not only admits but is intensely proud of this role.

In July 1940 he was busy organizing war propaganda campaigns in company with newspaper columnists, bankers, playwrights, book publishers, and even a preacher or two. He has since become a vice chairman of Fight For Freedom, Inc., the organization which put on a circus here this week, and is also a heavyweight among the "bundlers for Britain."

All these activities, naturally, have cut into his attention to the affairs of Fairfax County.

His opponent in the recent contest, Colonel Farr, was born in Fairfax, Va., December 10, 1880, and still lives in the house where first he saw the day. He was educated, as he puts it, "in a one-room schoolhouse," but managed to get across the Potomac and graduate from Georgetown Law School in 1907.

He has been a practicing lawyer in Fairfax County ever since, except for service in the Army during the last war, when he became a major—without going overseas. The "colonel" handle comes from his position as a lieutenant colonel in the Reserve Corps, United States Army.

As for the business of representing the people of Fairfax County, the colonel has some homey logic to offer which is passed on herewith for the benefit of Mr. Pickens and all others who may be interested in voters as people:

"During the last 60 days of my campaign I was far too busy talking up Dick Farr and local affairs to the voters of Fairfax County to trifle with international affairs.

"As a matter of fact, I didn't even bother to keep up with international affairs in the newspapers, although some time ago I did see an article in one of the papers—it was about a speech Mr. Miller made in which he advocated our participation in the war.

"I sensed the fact the voters were primarily interested in local affairs, so I just kept telling them to 'vote for Dick Farr' and he would try to give them what they wanted. I never once mentioned the international situation.

"From the vote it appears I was on the right track. Since Fairfax County is predominantly Democratic and I am a Republican, naturally it was the Democrats who elected me, and I'm going to thank them, too."

As far as he is concerned personally, says the colonel, he is rather mild either way on war. He believes we ought to arm to the teeth and not let anybody kick us around. But as for Mr. Miller's specifics, the colonel isn't having any.

He has never tried to run with the upper crust in Fairfax or in Washington, says the colonel, and didn't get any support from them in the late campaign. They were all too busy with Mr. Miller's world-saving projects and were sewed up for the opposition anyhow.

But even so—and even in supposedly fire-breathing Virginia—the plain people turned their backs on the world saver and hired a local boy to look after their interests in Richmond.

Straw in the wind for 1942?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. No Republican has been elected to Congress in Virginia.

Mr. NYE. I beg the Senator's pardon. A Republican from Fairfax County was elected to the State legislature.

Mr. GLASS. The Republicans in the State legislature number 4 out of 100. That is how strong they are.

Mr. NYE. The issue that was fought there was that involving our foreign policy.

Mr. President, there are few more widely accepted authorities on military matters than Hanson W. Baldwin, who is an editor of the New York Times. In a book which he has written he has said:

If a minority, vocal and vigorous and strident, leads the majority to a war it does not want, the minority and the nation will live to regret it. No modern war can be waged successfully without the wholehearted and enthusiastic cooperation of fully 90 percent of the people.

Mr. President, we ought to have known, as far back as the days of the embargo repeal and enactment of the lend-lease law, that we could not join hands with a belligerent at war, help it as we have helped, and not have a price to pay. I cannot bring myself to believe that the President himself thought we could avoid paying the price, however reassuring he seemed to be. We know now what the price paid thus far has been. We must see how much greater the cost can be and will be unless we abruptly check our actions. If we defeat the pending proposal, some insist the President will be embarrassed. If that be the case, then let the President bite his lips and take his own medicine. We and the people of this country still have a right to demand, and we do demand, that the President keep faith with the people of America, whatever may be the expectations from across the Atlantic by reason of implied or direct commitments made by agents of the American Government.

Mr. President, I have upon my desk petitions represented to me as carrying the names of approximately 50,000 mothers. The Mothers National Executive Committee submits them and asks that the attention of the Senate be called to their existence. I do not know where to refer them; I can only file them with the Senate, and I file them now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The petitions will be received and will lie on the table.

EXHIBIT 1

THE FIRST-LINE-OF-DEFENSE ARGUMENT

Those who argue that Britain and the British Navy are our first line of defense, and that we cannot defend the Western Hemisphere and enforce the Monroe Doctrine without their aid, either have forgotten, or wish to forget, both British and American history. I propose to recall that history so that, at least, the indisputable facts of history will be clear, so clear that they cannot be ignored. I speak thus with no feeling of hostility toward Britain, but rather with a feeling that America comes first. I speak with the hope that more Americans, and more members of this august body, will keep forever in their minds that old saying by that wise and cynical British master diplomat, Lord Palmerston: "England has no eternal enemies and no eternal friendships. She has only eternal interests."

A. Attitude of Britain toward the Monroe Doctrine: The argument is currently and persistently made that the Monroe Doctrine, which is the keystone of American foreign policy, was promulgated at the suggestion of Great Britain, that it has always been recognized and respected by Great Britain, and that without the support of British naval power the United States would have been unable to maintain it. This argument is made by some in high places either through ignorance of history or in deliberate attempt to distort it into an argument for American participation in the present European war. It is the purpose of this statement to show briefly that the Monroe Doctrine was independently asserted by President Monroe, that the British Government has persistently failed and refused to recognize it, that it has shown a disposition to disregard it, that the nearest the United States ever came to war in its defense was with Great Britain, and that we have never looked to British naval power for its defense.

BACKGROUND OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

When Great Britain found it either undesirable or impossible to cooperate with the Holy Alliance after the Congress of Vienna, she sought compensating alliances, commercial advantages, and territorial expansion in the Western Hemisphere. She hesitated to acknowledge the independence of the Latin-American states, which had but recently revolted from Spain, for fear of giving offense to Spain and creating undesired international complications in Europe. She was also determined that France should gain no further commercial or territorial advantage in the Western Hemisphere. She was alarmed at the extension of Russian naval power from Alaska down the western coast threatening the Oregon territory, in which she claimed an interest, and the coast of California, toward which she was already casting longing eyes. (Knox, Dudley W., *History of the United States Navy*.)

The Government of Great Britain was anxiously watching the situation in Latin America created by the recent revolt of those states from Spain and the growing power and prestige of the United States. In the early part of 1823, Stratford Canning, British Minister at Washington, reported to his chief that the American Cabinet was busy with new projects in the West Indies, that confidential agents had been dispatched to Porto Rico, that "the fate of Cuba is still an object of general discussion," and that one journalist had published an address to the Cubans with a view to inciting them to an "immediate declaration of independence." (F. O. America, March-August 1823, Stratford Canning to George Canning, April 9, 1823, No. 38.) The British commander in West Indian

waters instructed Captain Bouchier to learn all he could about Key West and its advantage as a naval base in case of war, but in his attempt to obtain the desired information not to arouse the suspicions of the Americans. (F. O. America, *ibid.*, Bouchier to Canning, April 19, 1823.)

Evidently both Great Britain and the United States realized the strategic importance of the control of Cuba. To the latter, it would be a stepping stone toward the rich Latin-American countries; to the former it would be an entering wedge between the Americas and an effective block to the southward expansion of the United States. For that reason Great Britain was eager either to secure such control or to bind the United States to an agreement not to acquire any territory or advantage in that region. Since the interests thus appeared mutually exclusive, Secretary of State John Quincy Adams insisted upon a purely American policy announced in a declaration to prevent the expansion thither of any foreign power including England. (Memoirs of J. Q. Adams by C. F. Adams, vol. VI, 1, 177, and 200, also the Latin American Policy of George Canning, *Temperley Am. Hist. Rev.*, vol. XI, p. 797, *Relation of British Policy to the Monroe Doctrine*, Lawson, 128-129.)

The commercial designs of Great Britain are clearly demonstrated. After the New York Commercial Advertiser on June 6, 1822, had again reminded its readers that "as we all are apprehensive notwithstanding our propinquity to them [the American Colonies of Spain], that the vigilant and indefatigable John Bull will get the start of us."

That statement had such an effect upon the commercial interests of Great Britain that it was copied by the London Times of July 3, 1822. Later on November 30, 1823, the Examiner attempted to rally the pride of British ambitions by the following statement:

"Could anything be more disgraceful in the British Ministers than to let the North Americans, with nothing like our motives, and some natural feeling to the contrary, get the start of us in establishing a profitable connection with the immense, fertile, and improving states of Southern America?"

The same sentiment was expressed in Bell's Weekly Messenger of June 20, 1824, and other British publications. (British Policy and the Monroe Doctrine, Lawson 99.)

OUR MONROE DOCTRINE

Great Britain therefore suggested that she and the United States jointly proclaim a policy opposing the extension of any other European country in the Western Hemisphere. On October 20, 1823, Mr. George Canning, British Foreign Secretary, wrote to Mr. Richard Rush, United States Minister in London:

"Is not the moment come when our Governments might understand each other as to the Spanish-American colonies? And if we can arrive at such an understanding would it not be expedient for ourselves, and beneficial for all the world, that the principles of it should be clearly settled and plainly avowed?"

Canning was still unwilling to acknowledge the independence of the new Latin-American states and to all the arguments which he presented in the hope of persuading the United States to join her policy with that of Great Britain, Rush replied that the entire matter could be satisfactorily concluded if only Great Britain would accord such recognition (Rush, *The Court of London*, p. 405). Canning's persistent refusal to accord such recognition was based partly upon his belief that the new states had not yet attained sufficient internal stability, but perhaps more upon his fear of embarrassment in European politics and the encouragement of revolt within some colonies of the British Empire, and partly upon his own preference

for the monarchical form of government and the unpopularity of republicanism in Europe in general. (Stapleton, *Life of Canning*, vol. II, p. 22; Temperley, *George Canning*, p. 179.)

Rush, however, was bound to be firm in his insistence upon their immediate recognition as a price of any joint policy. (Rush, *Ibid.*) Thereupon the negotiations regarding a joint declaration of policy terminated on October 8, 1823. In his letter to Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, announcing this termination, Mr. Rush said:

"It appears that having ends of her own in view, she has been anxious to facilitate their accomplishment by invoking my auxiliary offices as the Minister of the United States at this court [St. James]; but as to the independence of the new States of America, for their own benefit, that this seems quite another question in her diplomacy." (Ford, John Quincy Adams, *His Connection With the Monroe Doctrine*, pp. 56-57, Rush to Adams, October 10, 1823.)

Great Britain resented our separate and independent proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine because it excluded her as well as every other European nation from territorial and political expansion in the Western Hemisphere and she refused to respect it. Canning said:

"I sought for compensation in another hemisphere. * * * I resolved that if France had Spain, it should not be Spain with the Indies [Spanish-American colonies]. I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old." (Speech, December 22, 1826.)

The Spanish-American colonies had won their independence by their own valor and had been recognized as independent governments 2 years before Great Britain took action in the matter. (The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish-America, by J. H. Latane, pp. 86-87.)

BRITAIN OPPOSES THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Canning was so much irritated by our independent proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine that he retaliated by excluding the United States from participating with Great Britain and Russia in the settlement of the Alaska boundary question.

On the 4th of January 1824 Rush wrote to Secretary Middleton that it was the intention of Great Britain to proceed separately, saying:

"The resumption of its original course by this [British] Government has arisen chiefly from the principle which our Government has adopted of not considering the American Continents as subjects for future colonization by any European powers, a principle to which Great Britain does not accede."

The real purpose of Canning was revealed by his statement of December 7, 1824, when in speaking of the Monroe Doctrine he said, "The deed is done; the nail is driven; Spanish-America is free; and if we do not mismanage our affairs badly she is English." By reason of the fact that the United States had now recognized the independence of the Latin-American countries, England was now free also to accord such recognition without her previous fear of provoking the enmity of Spain or of France. England was, of course, able to furnish more capital for loans needed by the new governments of the new States and their people. Canning referred to such investments in Buenos Aires as "mere commercial speculations." Mr. Hervey, the commissioner to Mexico, reported to the home office in London, March 30, 1824, "Without the temporary aid afforded by Mr. Staples, the Government would have labored under the greatest embarrassment indeed." For this apparent attempt to guarantee the loan Mr. Hervey was recalled, not because of this fact but largely because of the publicity which was caused thereby. (American Diplomacy, Fish, 215-216.)

In maintaining that Great Britain could not accept the Monroe Doctrine, Canning said

that she could not "acknowledge the right of any power to proclaim such a principle, much less to bind other countries to the observance of it. If we are to be repelled from the shores of America, it would not matter to us whether that repulsion were effected by the ukase of Russia excluding us from the sea, or by the new doctrine of the President prohibiting us from the land. But we cannot yield obedience to either. * * * (Quoted in American Policy, Bigelow, p. 53; see also The Monroe Doctrine, Reddaway, p. 97.)

Canning referred to the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine by President Monroe as "very extraordinary," and announced that the principle was one which His Majesty's ministers were prepared to combat in the most equivocal manner, stating that "whatever right of colonizing the unappropriated portions of America has been hitherto enjoyed by Great Britain in common with the other powers of Europe, may still be exercised in perfect freedom." (The Monroe Doctrine, W. F. Reddaway, p. 97.)

Major John Bigelow, United States Army, retired, in American Policy, the Western Hemisphere in its Relation to the Eastern, page 54, says:

"To the end of his career, it was Canning's purpose to thwart and oppose the Monroe Doctrine. On every occasion he impressed Latin-American governments the advantage for them of an alliance with Great Britain over an alliance with the United States. His successors in office have in general taken this attitude. No other nation has criticised and contravened the Monroe Doctrine to anything like the extent that Great Britain has." (Also Later American Policy of George Canning, American Historical Review, vol. 11; English Policy Towards America, 1790-1 et al.)

The reasons for that attitude on the part of Great Britain are easily evident from the following statement by Lawson:

"While the Monroe Doctrine represented in part an Anglo-American policy, its prohibition of future colonization on the American continents was distinctly offensive to Great Britain, and made necessary its separate declaration by the Government of the United States. On the other hand, had the Government of the United States failed entirely to declare its policy, and permitted Great Britain alone to act in seeking to prevent European intervention in South America, it is probable that the gratitude of the new states would have enabled the British to gain a controlling influence over them." (The Relation of British Policy to the Declaration of the Monroe Doctrine, Leonard Axel Lawson; also American Historical Review, vol. VIII, pp. 37-38.)

John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, refused to be impressed by the attempts of Great Britain to convince him and our diplomats that she was interested in joining with us in order to protect us from what she called a threat of the Holy Alliance against the Western Hemisphere. It was Great Britain that feared the Holy Alliance and was seeking friendship from her late enemy, the United States. Secretary Adams said in response to the attempts to frighten him:

"I no more believe that the Holy Alliance will restore the Spanish dominion than that Chimborazo will sink beneath the ocean." (Diary of John Quincy Adams.)

Really, Secretary Adams was more afraid of aggressive designs from the British than from the Holy Alliance. He assumed a courageous position and, of course, invited the cooperation of Great Britain as well as that of other nations, but did not depend upon it. He said:

"My reliance upon the cooperation of Great Britain rested not upon her principles, but upon her interests." (Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, vol. VI, p. 203.)

On account of the position of Great Britain in European politics at that time, she is a

sense welcomed the Monroe Doctrine for the time being for it prevented the expansion of any other European or Asiatic power in Latin-America. In order to "save the face" of British diplomats, the policy of the United States was represented to Great Britain and the European nations as an endorsement of British policy. (Later American Policy of George Canning, Temperley American Historical Review, vol. XI, p. 779.)

To the extent that the Monroe Doctrine prohibited other European nations from extending their sovereignty or any territorial designs that they might have had toward the Western Hemisphere, it was welcomed by Great Britain. To the extent that it prohibited her as well, it was resented by her and met with her severe criticism. (Some correspondence of George Canning, Stapleton, vol. II, pp. 79-80.) The declaration of President Monroe went far beyond Canning's expectations; and it has been that part of the Monroe Doctrine over which Anglo-American relations have occasionally become much disturbed. (Lawson, *ibid.*, pp. 143-144.)

The historic attitude of Great Britain is well expressed by Lord Palmerston, later Prime Minister of Great Britain, in the words: "England has no eternal enmities and no eternal friendships. She has only eternal interests."

The historic attitude of Great Britain toward the Monroe Doctrine has been one of criticism, disregard, and defiance.

Under date of May 2, 1854, Canning wrote to the United States Minister at London, in part, as follows:

"* * * with regard to the doctrine laid down by President Monroe in 1823, concerning the future colonization of the American Continents by European states, as an international axiom which ought to regulate the conduct of European states, it can only be viewed as the dictum of the distinguished personage who delivered it, but Her Majesty's Government cannot accept that doctrine as an international axiom which ought to regulate the conduct of European states." (Later Latin-American Policy of George Canning; also English Policy Toward America, p. 7, 706.)

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 was the result of aggressive pressure on the United States for a s. are in the zone of influence in Central America. It has been considered the most unpopular treaty to which the United States was ever a party, and it was a humiliating effort on the part of our country to avoid a third war with Great Britain because of her long and persistent attempts to take possession of Nicaragua for the purpose of constructing a canal through the Isthmus to provide a shorter commercial route between England and her possessions in the Far East. Surveys had been made long before, and upon the insistence of Sir Henry Bulwer, British Minister to the United States, the treaty was finally consummated with the two nations jointly guaranteeing the neutrality of any canal to be constructed across the Isthmus. A later Senate Committee on Foreign Relations thus characterized the treaty:

"The attitude assumed by the American Secretary of State [Mr. Clayton] was so strangely inconsistent alike with the interests and with the dignity of the United States that it is impossible for the committee to advert to it without pain. Mr. Clayton weekly sought to induce Great Britain to abandon her own unfounded claims on the territory of an independent Spanish-American state by inviting her to share with us the duty and privilege peculiarly our own, of protecting an interoceanic communication of infinite interest and concern to this country." (American Policy, Bigelow, *ibid.*, p. 88-89.)

This was a policy of appeasement which brought forth the famous denunciation of Senator Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate while the treaty was under

consideration for ratification. He said in part:

"When Nicaragua desired to confer the privilege (of constructing the proposed canal), and when we were willing to accept it, it was purely an American question, with which England had no right to interfere. It was an American question about which Europe had no right to be consulted. * * * Jamaica at present commands the entrance of the (projected) canal; and all that Great Britain desired was, inasmuch as she had possession of the only place commanding the Canal, to procure a stipulation that no other power would erect a fortification near its terminus. That stipulation is equivalent to an agreement that England may fortify, but that we never shall."

Douglas thus relates a part of the conversation between himself and Sir Henry Bulwer:

"I told him it [the treaty] would be fair if they would add one word to the treaty so that it would read that neither Great Britain nor the United States should ever occupy or hold dominion over Central America or Asia. 'But,' answered he, 'you have no interest in Asia.' 'No,' answered I, 'and you have none in Central America.' 'But,' said he, 'you can never establish any rights in Asia.' 'No,' said I, 'and we don't mean that you shall ever establish any in America.'" (Stephen A. Douglas, C. E. Carr, p. 36.)

As a result of the treaty the United States found itself barred by its terms from acquiring coaling stations when it sought them after the Civil War. Our appeals to the British Government through Lord Aberdeen for a waiver of the terms that caused that unforeseen eventuality did not receive the courtesy of a reply. Major Bigelow said that "our Government made repeated attempts to secure a coaling station on the island of Haiti, but it was thwarted principally by Great Britain. That it succeeded, by the Spanish-American War, in securing one in Cuba and others in the Philippines is due to Germany, whose naval development determined Great Britain to cultivate friendly relations with the United States." (American Policy, Bigelow, p. 94.)

BRITISH DESIGNS ON LATIN AMERICA

That Great Britain intended her enforced participation in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty to be an entering wedge for expansion and control in the Latin-American states seems evident despite the apparent assurance in the communication of Sir Henry Bulwer to our State Department while the treaty was pending in the Senate. He said in part:

"I am also desired to add that it would be contrary to the fixed and settled policy of Great Britain to entangle herself by any engagement to protect distant states over whose policy and conduct it would be impossible for the British Government to exercise any effective control. Such a protectorate would confer no possible advantage on Great Britain, and might become the source of many embarrassments to her. * * *

This was at the time understood by the Senate to be a disclaimer of any intention of further interference or expansion in Latin America, but Senator Stephen A. Douglas later found occasion to say on the floor of the Senate that—

"The treaty was ratified, and in less than 3 years Great Britain seizes the Bay Islands and erects them into a colony in the face of this friendly assurance and in direct violation of the provisions of the treaty" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

BRITAIN SEIZES BELIZE

In 1862, when the United States was beset with embarrassments at home and abroad on account of the Civil War, Great Britain took advantage of the situation and erected the settlement of Belize in Central America into a Crown colony in violation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty as well as in contra-

vention of the Monroe Doctrine. The helplessness of the United States under the circumstances, of which Great Britain was well aware, alone prevented Secretary of State Seward from making an effective protest. (Bigelow, *ibid.*, pp. 97-98.)

Captain Mahan, in his *The Interest of America in Sea Power, Past and Present*, thus states the real position of Great Britain with relation to the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty:

"The interest of Great Britain still lies, as it then lay, in the maintenance of the treaty. So long as the United States jealousy resents all foreign interference at the Isthmus, and at the same time takes no steps to formulate a policy or develop a strength that can give shape and force to her own pretensions, just so long will the absolute control over any probable contingency of the future rest with Great Britain, by virtue of her naval positions, her naval power, and her omnipresent capital." (Mahan, pp. 93-94.)

"A recent unofficial British estimate of the British policy at the Isthmus, as summarized in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, may here have interest: 'In the United States was recognized a coming formidable rival to British trade. In the face of the estimated disadvantage to European trade in general, and that of Great Britain in particular, to be looked for from a Central American canal, British statesmen, finding their last attempt to control the most feasible route (by Nicaragua) abortive, accomplished the next best object in the interest of British trade. They cast the onus of building the Canal on the people who would reap the greatest advantage from it, and who were bound to keep everyone else out, but were at the same time very unlikely to undertake such a gigantic enterprise outside their own undeveloped territories for many a long year; while at the same time they skillfully handicapped that country (the United States) in favor of British sea power by entering into a joint guaranty to respect its neutrality when built.'" (Mahan, *ibid.*, pp. 94-95.)

NEW ZEALAND

In contravention of the understanding of the Monroe Doctrine, Great Britain in 1840 colonized New Zealand, the Fiji Islands in 1874, and the Solomon Islands in 1885. The first two groups are wholly, and the latter partly, within the Western Hemisphere. (Bigelow, *ibid.*)

FALKLAND ISLANDS

The case of the Falkland Islands, off Cape Horn in the extreme south Atlantic, furnishes another illustration of the attitude of Great Britain toward the Monroe Doctrine. The islands were first explored by an Englishman, John Strong (Voyages and Works of Jogn Davis, A. H. Markham, p. 108 n.). They were not settled, and after many conflicting occupations and claims of different nations, which are not here recounted, the islands were practically abandoned and left uninhabited for many years. In 1833, after Argentina had declared her independence from Spain and had been led by their history to regard them as her territory and had been assured by the Monroe Doctrine of her undisturbed possession of them, Great Britain reasserted her ancient claim to them. Major Bigelow in his *American Policy* states the case briefly as follows:

"Great Britain took them (the Falkland Islands) with the double object of preventing the United States from having them and of making more or less use of them as a depot of supply and repair for vessels rounding Cape Horn. Upon the British reoccupation in 1833, the sovereignty became a subject of dispute between Great Britain and Argentina. [The right of neither was perfect. Great Britain may be credited with the original exploration of the islands. Beyond that she had no right in them but that of spoliation. The first power to appropriate the islands and the first to establish a settlement on them

was France. From her they passed by cession to Spain. Argentina had held them by right of revolution, or forcible expropriation, from Spain.] Neither Great Britain nor Argentina had by treaty or otherwise any cession from Spain. This was a case for arbitration. It was decided by an act of war and may, therefore, be considered as a contravention of the Monroe Doctrine. Out of respect for British battleships, or in consideration of the remoteness of the Falkland Islands from the United States, or from both of those motives, the United States has not seen fit to press the Monroe Doctrine with respect to this bit of American territory."

BAY ISLANDS

The Monroe Doctrine was contravened by Great Britain in the Bay Islands already mentioned in the matter of their erection into a British Crown colony and further in their return to Honduras in 1859, by providing in the treaty of transfer that they shall not be ceded by that republic "or any of them, or the right of sovereignty, to any nation or state whatsoever."

MOSQUITO COUNTRY

Another and a similar contravention of the Monroe Doctrine by Great Britain occurred in 1860, when in transferring the Mosquito country to Nicaragua, she stipulated that the district assigned to the Mosquito Indians "may not be ceded by them to any foreign person or state, but shall be and remain under the sovereignty of the Republic of Nicaragua."

The purpose of Great Britain was thus clearly to prevent the United States from obtaining any coaling or naval stations or bases in that region within reach of the Isthmian Canal routes, so far as Great Britain could be in a position to prevent it.

The United States had already begun to realize how she had restricted herself by the questionable and much-criticized Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and she now sought to free herself from its objectionable restrictions into which she had suffered herself to be unwittingly drawn in admitting Great Britain as a limited partner in Central America. Great Britain responded to our proposal to abrogate the treaty by asserting that in that case she would contravene the Monroe Doctrine at her discretion. The following is typical of her attitude:

"From the abrogation of that compact, if it should take place, they (Her Majesty's Government) will hold themselves free to act in regard to Central America in the manner most conducive to the advancement of British interests." (Malmesbury to Napier, April 8, 1858.)

This threat was repeated when in 1882, Secretary of State Frelinghuysen sought through Lord Granville to bring about abrogation of the treaty. (Granville to West, January 14, 1882.)

VENEZUELA

The Venezuela boundary controversy was the culmination of a long series of encroachments by Great Britain upon the territory of Venezuela by pushing out claims of the boundary line between that country and British Guiana. The entire region in controversy belonging originally to Spain by right of discovery. It was subsequently transferred in part to Holland. Great Britain succeeded to the rights of Holland in 1814 and Venezuela to the rights of Spain by her secession from Colombia in 1830. There were certain details of the boundary left undefined. After a long series of claims and increased demands by Great Britain, in which she claimed free navigation of the Orinoco River and extended her demands far beyond any previous claim or color of title, she took possession of the main mouth of the Orinoco and declared Barima a British port; and finally, in 1893, by Lord Rosebery, proposed a line far to the west of even his own previous proposal.

Venezuela had meanwhile severed diplomatic relations with Great Britain but continued her efforts at friendly negotiations. President Cleveland, in his message to Congress on December 17, 1895, declared Great Britain to be in violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and accordingly informed our Minister in London that unless the boundary line could be fixed by the parties concerned it would be determined and fixed by an arbitral commission appointed by himself. Great Britain resented this action as a demonstration of "shirt sleeve democracy." The old controversy had, in our opinion, gone beyond the stage of an honest boundary dispute and had assumed the character of aggression. The matter may be briefly stated in the words of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in the *North American Review*, June 1895, as follows:

"England's motives in her Venezuelan movements are, of course, entirely honorable and disinterested, because England herself admits freely on all occasions that these are her characteristic qualities in dealing with other nations. It is easy also to appreciate England's natural and strong resentment toward a country she has injured as much as she has injured Venezuela. * * * The practical result of England's aggressions in Venezuela is plain enough. They are all directed to securing control of the Orinoco, the great river system of northern South America, and also of the rich mining district of the Yuruari. All that England has done has been a direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and she has increased and quickened her aggressions in proportion as the United States have appeared indifferent. The time has come for decisive action. The United States must either maintain the Monroe Doctrine and treat its infringement as an act of hostility or abandon it. If Great Britain is to be permitted to occupy the ports of Nicaragua and, still worse, take the territory of Venezuela, there is nothing to prevent her taking the whole of Venezuela, or any other South American state. If Great Britain can do this with impunity, France and Germany will do it also. These powers have already seized the islands of the Pacific and parceled out Africa. Great Britain cannot extend her possessions in the east. She has pretty nearly reached the limit of what can be secured in Africa. She is now turning her attention to South America. If the United States are prepared to see South America pass gradually into the hands of Great Britain and other European powers and to be hemmed in by British naval posts, nothing more to be said. But the American people are not ready to abandon the Monroe Doctrine. * * * They are not now and never will be willing to have South America and the islands adjacent to the United States seized by European powers. * * * It is not too late to peacefully but firmly put an end to these territorial aggressions of Great Britain and to enforce the Monroe Doctrine so that no other power will be disposed to infringe upon it."

In order to prevent a settlement of the controversy by the United States acting as threatened by President Cleveland, or a war with the United States, Great Britain agreed with Venezuela upon arbitration. Major Bigelow, in his *American Policy*, said of this incident:

"Great Britain was not simply protecting her actual interests but was endeavoring to enlarge them—to increase her possessions in the Western Hemisphere; her attitude, ostensibly defensive, was fundamentally aggressive. Isthmian Canal controversies may be considered as unavoidable; this boundary controversy was of Great Britain's deliberate seeking."

The details of the settlement are unimportant for this purpose, but the fact of the final recognition of the Monroe Doctrine by

Great Britain, is important as following the threat of President Cleveland "to resist by every means in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain over any territory . . . which . . . belongs to Venezuela." In the words of John Bassett Moore:

"The most important political result of the Venezuela incident was not the decision upon the territorial question, but the official adoption of the Monroe Doctrine by the Congress of the United States, and its explicit acceptance by the principal maritime power of Europe." (Great Britain) Principles of American Diplomacy, John Bassett Moore, p. 251.)

During the controversy over the Venezuela boundary question, Lord Salisbury, British Prime Minister, challenged the Monroe Doctrine, and Lord Grenville voiced the same attitude in a letter to our Secretary of State saying that it " . . . was a mere assertion of force having no standing in international law and had the place in diplomatic argument as a list of the military or naval forces."

Other instances of British attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine, amounting to aggression or threats of aggression may be briefly summarized as follows:

GUATEMALA

In 1829, Great Britain made such boundary encroachments against the Republic of Guatemala that that country had occasion to appeal to the United States. (Samuel Flagg Bemis, Diplomatic History of the United States, p. 251.)

BELIZE AGAIN

Again in 1835, encroachments of the British in Belize against Guatemalan territory occasioned appeal to the United States for protection. (Bemis, *ibid.* 247.)

HAWAII

In 1842 Great Britain blockaded San Juan de Nicaragua. In 1843 a British naval officer seized the island of Hawaii in the Hawaii Island group, which was evacuated only upon vigorous protest by the United States. (Bemis, 348.)

ARGENTINA

During the period 1845-49, Great Britain, in cooperation with the French, blockaded the coast of Argentina. This action, instigated under the direction of Lord Palmerston, was denounced in America as "equivalent to stopping neutral vessels on the high seas and making them pay blackmail." (Bemis, *ibid.*, p. 397.)

NICARAGUA

In 1848, in a controversy with the Mosquito Indians concerning an overland route to the interior, the British seized the Nicaraguan port of Greytown, commanding the mouth of the San Juan River, as Mosquito territory. Nicaragua found it necessary to call upon the United States for protest and protection. (American Diplomacy, Fish, p. 292; Bemis, *ibid.*, 248; History of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, I. D. Davis, Michigan Political Science Publications, 1900, III, No. 8.)

SALVADOR

In 1851 Great Britain laid an embargo on the western coast of Salvador, thus assuming the character of aggression. The next year, 1852, as alluded to by Senator Stephen A. Douglas in his denunciation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty already referred to, the British made another attempt at territorial expansion in Central America when they landed soldiers on the Bay Islands and declared them to be a British Crown colony. Senator Douglas characterized this act as "in direct violation of the provisions of the treaty." (Clayton-Bulwer.) (Bemis, *ibid.*, 415.) This incident followed the seizure, 1850, of the strategically important Tigre Island in the Gulf of Fonseca, bordering on the coasts of Salva-

dor, Honduras, and Nicaragua. The British flag was raised under the pretext of securing claims against Honduras. (Bemis, *ibid.*, p. 249.) This, with possession of the San Juan River, would control the Nicaraguan canal route.

In 1895, Great Britain levied a fine upon Nicaragua for an offense to her dignity and upon nonpayment she sent warships and took possession of the town of Corinto. The United States Government protested this as an act of aggression. Our use of force was prevented only by the willingness of the republics of Costa Rica, San Salvador, and Guatemala to subscribe a sum sufficient to pay the fine. This ended the tension. (Bigelow, *ibid.* 130.)

VENEZUELA AGAIN

In 1903 Great Britain, Germany, and France jointly established what amounted practically to a blockade of ports of Venezuela for the purpose of enforcing the collection of debts. Although they all disclaimed any intention of seeking territorial advantage, and it was mutually conceded not directly to involve the Monroe Doctrine, the matter was settled only after strong protest and threats by President Theodore Roosevelt, and our agreement to take charge of the customs receipts for the satisfaction of their claims.

ANTARCTIC

In various ways but in pursuit of her "eternal interests" as stated by Lord Palmerston, Great Britain has annexed Graham Land and South Georgia, lying south of the Falkland Islands, and she claimed and placed under the British flag another territory, Falkland Island Dependency, in the Antarctic Ocean—all in the Western Hemisphere. (The Way of the Aggressor, John Michael, p. 528, also the British Empire, James Frederick Green, pp. 48-49.)

TEXAS

The secession of Texas from Mexico and her prospective annexation to the United States furnishes another indication of the designs of Great Britain toward the Western Hemisphere. Lord Aberdeen, British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, in a letter written June 1, 1842, said of the then independent country of Texas:

"That nation [Texas] will become the ally and the main protection of Mexico either against the United States or against those States contiguous with Texas, into which that portion of the United States may in future times have separated."

Lord Aberdeen suggested to France the formation of an alliance against the United States, proposing resort to war if necessary to prevent the United States from annexing Texas.

The designs of Great Britain in connection with the Mexican and Texan trouble were so evident that they occasioned the premature occupation of Monterey, Calif., by Commodore Catesby Jones, commanding the Pacific squadron. In his History of the United States Navy, Capt. Dudley W. Knox says:

"Jones was generally aware of the contemporary diplomatic friction with Mexico over Texas, in which England was also seriously involved, and he knew of our controversy with England over Oregon. He was familiar, too, with the rapidly expanding American and British commercial interests and territorial ambitions on the California coast and northward, which had given rise to reports that England was negotiating with Mexico for the acquisition of California. . . . They (Commodore Jones and Mr. Pickett, American chargé d'affaires at Lima, Peru) were in agreement that England was about to take possession of California, probably under a secret treaty with Mexico, and that our Government would wish to forestall her if possible." (History of the United States Navy, Knox, pp. 159-160.)

CIVIL WAR—BRITAIN FAVORS THE SOUTH

The attitude of Great Britain toward the United States during the period of the War between the States is generally known and cannot be studied here in detail, but only a few indications will be given. At the beginning of the war, according to Captain Knox in his History of the United States Navy—

"Competing British ships were able to capture a large share of our trade. . . . The American merchant marine has never since recovered its previous prosperity. . . . Among the most important of the various services rendered by the Federal Navy in its exercise of the command of the sea was the prevention of foreign interference. . . . This was notably true of England,

with her great carrying trade and huge cotton-spinning business, which depended critically upon products of raw cotton from southern plantations. In addition, there was a widespread sympathy for the Confederate cause, and on many occasions she would apparently have been glad to come to the support of the South but for the power of the Federal Navy. Through the connivance of British officials, these efforts (purchase and construction of Confederate raiders) met with some success from time to time, despite protests of the American Ambassador, and this, together with other unneutral services rendered to the raiders at overseas British ports, formed the basis of the so-called Alabama claims, settled in our favor for \$15,500,000 after the war. Those raiders, which were fitted out or substantially aided illegally in British ports, accounted for about 90 percent of the total damage done to Federal shipping by Confederate cruisers." (History of the United States Navy, Knox, pp. 191, 296-297.)

Something of British hopes is indicated by Spencer Walpole in his following statement:

"Many Englishmen in and out of Parliament were disposed to consider that the great and growing Republic of the Western Hemisphere was becoming too large and too powerful, and that the interests of both Europe and Great Britain would be best served by its disruption." (History of Twenty-five Years, II, p. 39.)

The Russian Ambassador at the Court of St. James's in London thus expressed his observations at that time:

"The British Government, at the bottom of its heart, desires the separation of North America into two republics, which will watch each other jealously and counterbalance one the other. Then England, on terms of peace and commerce with both, would have nothing to fear from either, for she would dominate them, restraining them by their rival ambitions."

William E. Gladstone considered the possibility of an Anglo-Franco-Russian alliance against the United States during the Civil War. Lord Palmerston, then Prime Minister, wrote:

"It is in the highest degree likely that the North will not be able to subdue the South and it is no doubt certain that if the southern union is established as an independent state, it would afford a valuable and extensive market for British manufactures."

In 1864, while in the House of Commons, Mr. Roebuck said:

"In 80 years, not America, but Europe, made the Republic (the United States) such a power that, if she had continued as she was a few years ago, she would have been the great bully of the world. As far as my influence goes, I am determined to do all I can to prevent the reconstruction of the Union, and I hope that the balance of power on the American Continent will in the future prevent any one state from tyrannizing over the world as the Republic did."

The London Times of October 6, 1862, characterized President Lincoln as "among that catalog of monsters, the wholesale assassins

and butchers of mankind." Blackwood's magazine referred to the emancipation proclamation as "monstrous, reckless, devilish."

BRAZIL

Something of her "eternal interests" as stated by Lord Palmerston has evidently motivated the attitude of the British Government to the recent past. In the spring of 1918 the De Bunsen mission was sent to the South American nations on the pretense of explaining the war aims of Great Britain, but actually secretly to negotiate with Brazil a treaty which would have given Britain every possible trade advantage and a practical monopoly of the building of shipyards and ships for Brazil. (Harvey Weston in *Scribner's Commentator*, September 1941.)

According to Mr. Weston as above, the memorandum of Admiral Benson, of the United States Navy, charges Walter Long, First Lord of the British Admiralty, and Admiral Wemyss, First Sea Lord of the British Admiralty, in Paris, in 1919, with warning the American Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, saying:

"(England) could not look with equanimity upon the large merchant marine that was being built up by the United States, and that the increased naval program seemed to be intended as a means of controlling the sea from a naval viewpoint, and that Great Britain could not feel satisfied in coming out of the war with the tremendous losses she sustained in men, money, and ships, and in addition becoming a second-rate sea power commercially or otherwise."

Continuing from Mr. Weston, after the last World War, Sir Frank Fox thus expressed his estimate of the United States:

"Since the beginning of the nineteenth century the United States has been responsible for more arbitrary aggressions against the liberty of other peoples to manage (or mismanage) their own affairs than has any European nation." (Weston, *ibid.*)

The viewpoint of the Latin American states of today is indicated by Hon. Ricardo J. Alfaro, Minister of Panama to the United States, upon the occasion of the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine. On January 1924, he said:

"It is a mistake to believe, as many do, that the British Premier, Mr. Canning, was in favor of the Monroe Doctrine such as it was proclaimed. . . . His motives were above all the commercial interests of his own country, and the purpose of avoiding that the balance of power should be broken to the detriment and danger of Great Britain. . . . But it is a proven fact of history that when the energetic dictum of Monroe was known by him (Canning) he was very emphatic in stating that the doctrine proclaimed by the American President was unacceptable to Great Britain." (A Century of the Monroe Doctrine.)

Mr. Alejandro Alvarez, in his *El Derecho Internacional Americano* in comparing and contrasting the Monroe Doctrine with the so-called Bolivar idea, said:

"The Monroe Doctrine represents the interests of the whole continent (both continents), and all the states of America are of accord for its maintenance. So that, while the United States has remained thus far its only defender, Latin American states would not be found strong enough to maintain it, if the United States should refuse to do so." (P. 173; also *Le Vol de L'Aigle* de Monroe a Roosevelt, by Joseph Ribet, p. 38.)

Dr. Rodriguez Lareta, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Argentina, memorializing the Monroe Doctrine referred to it as covering "as with a shield our hard-won independence." (Principles of American Diplomacy, John Bassett Moore, p. 415.)

B. The United States has never depended upon British naval power for support of the Monroe Doctrine: It is and has always been

an American policy, proclaimed and maintained by America alone.

Secretary of State Olney said in connection with the Venezuelan boundary case that "the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interpositions."

Capt. A. T. Mahan, United States Navy, in his authoritative work, *The Interest of America in Sea Power, Present and Future*, published in 1897, said:

"The precise value of the Monroe Doctrine is understood very loosely by most Americans, but the effect of the familiar phrase has been to develop a national sensitiveness, which is a more frequent cause of war than material interests; and over disputes caused by such feelings there will preside none of the calming influence due to the moral authority of international law, with its recognized principles, for the points in dispute will be of policy, of interest, not of conceded right. Already France and Great Britain are giving to ports held by them a degree of artificial strength uncalled for by their present importance. They look to the near future. Among the islands and on the mainland there are many positions of great importance, held now by weak or unstable states. Is the United States willing to see them sold to a powerful rival? But what right will she invoke against the transfer? She can allege but one—that of her reasonable policy supported by her might. . . . Great Britain is undoubtedly the most formidable of our possible enemies, both by her great navy and by the strong positions she holds near our coasts. . . . Both nations doubtless, and properly, seek their own advantage." (Mahan, pp. 21, 27.)

"In the Caribbean, the sensitive resentment by our people of any supposed fresh encroachment by another state of the European family has been manifested too plainly and too recently to admit of dispute. Such an attitude of itself demands of us to be ready to support it by organized force, exactly as the mutual jealousy of states within the European Continent imposes upon them the maintenance of their great armies." (Mahan, pp. 264-265.)

In his opening address as President of the American Society of International Law, at Washington, D. C., April 22, 1914, Elihu Root, former Secretary of State and in his day regarded as the leading American authority on international politics, said:

"The statements [of President Monroe] . . . were intended to carry to Russia and incidentally to England the idea that the rights to territory in the New World must thenceforth rest upon the then existing titles, and that the United States would dispute any attempt to future occupation."

Hon. Charles E. Hughes, then Secretary of State and later Chief Justice, in an address before the American Bar Association, August 30, 1923, said:

"As the policy embodied in the Monroe Doctrine is distinctly the policy of the United States, the Government of the United States reserves to itself its definition, interpretation, and application. . . . As President Wilson observed, 'the Monroe Doctrine was produced by the United States on her own authority. It has always been maintained upon her own responsibility.'"

President Wilson has at different times thus expressed the American view of the Monroe Doctrine and our reliance upon American defense of it. In an address at the Manhattan Club in New York, November 4, 1915, he said:

"It has been the American policy time out of mind to look to the Navy as the first and chief line of defense. The Navy of the United States is already a very great and efficient force. Not rapidly, but slowly, with careful attention, our naval force has been

developed until the Navy of the United States stands recognized as one of the most efficient and notable of the modern time."

In an address before the Second Pan American Scientific Congress, January 6, 1916, President Wilson said:

"The Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed by the United States on her own authority. It has always been maintained, and always will be maintained, upon her own responsibility."

During his western tour in the interest of national preparedness President Wilson, at Topeka, Kans., on February 2, 1916, said:

"We have made ourselves the guarantors of the rights of national sovereignty and of popular sovereignty on this side of the water in both the continents of the Western Hemisphere. . . . America knows that the only thing that sustains the Monroe Doctrine and all the inferences that flow from it, is her own moral and physical force. The Monroe Doctrine is not a part of international law. The Monroe Doctrine has never been formally accepted by any international agreement. The Monroe Doctrine merely rests upon the statement that if certain things happen, she will do certain things. So, nothing sustains the honor of the United States in respect of these long-cherished and long-admired promises except her own moral physical force."

The next day, February 3, 1916, at St. Louis, President Wilson said:

"America has incomparably the most adequate navy in the world."

Under circumstances in which they were speaking of interest in America first and without attempting to formulate an argument for participation in foreign wars, Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, in testimony before the Committee on Naval Affairs, on January 8, 1940, said:

"At the time of the Washington treaties of 1922, the United States Navy, including vessels then in process of building, was much superior to any other navy. . . . The United States intends to maintain a navy capable of defending its territories and its vital interests wherever they may be. . . . The Naval Establishment provided (act of May 17, 1938, and other legislation appeared) reasonably adequate. This establishment was designed solely to defend ourselves against any single major power and was based upon such information as you have available."

In speaking of the self-reliance of the Americas to defend themselves without consideration of any foreign influence or assistance, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said to the Inter-American Conference, meeting at Buenos Aires in December 1936:

"In our determination to live at peace among ourselves, we in the Americas make it at the same time clear that we stand shoulder to shoulder in our final determination that others who, driven by war madness or land hunger might seek to commit acts of aggression against us, will find a hemisphere wholly prepared to consult together for our mutual safety and our mutual good."

In confirmation of the above confidence in our ability to stand upon our own defenses, President Roosevelt, in a message to the Congress on May 16, 1940, said:

"The Navy is stronger today than at any period in our Nation's history. Today also a large program of new construction is well under way. Ship for ship, ours are equal to or better than the vessels of any foreign power."

America is not dependent upon Great Britain as her first line of defense. America stands and has always stood in the strong position of splendid isolation, as remote as she chose to be from the eternal conflicting imperialisms of Europe and Asia. America is safe as long as she considers America first and heeds the venerable founders of our Nation.

THE INVASION ARGUMENT

With the consideration of this bill to repeal the provisions of the neutrality law which forbid American ships to enter combat zones and which forbid the arming of American ships, the Senate of the United States faces the question of direct, inevitable participation in the European war. How have we come to this pass, in the face of the unquestioned opposition of 80 percent of the American people to such involvement in the war? What asserted dangers have carried such weight with this great body that we even dare consider becoming a belligerent? It is my purpose today to discuss three contentions, none of them, in my judgment, sound, which have persuaded many Members of the Senate that we must fight.

As I have observed events, it has seemed to me that the war party has rung the most effective changes upon three different arguments, which I designate briefly as "the invasion argument," "the raw materials argument," and "the first line of defense argument." The invasion argument has been used to frighten the American people into believing that they must fight because we otherwise face a danger of invasion, either of our own shores or of Latin America, by the Axis hordes. The raw materials argument has been used to frighten those who knew enough of the military and naval factors involved to realize that we faced no danger of invasion. Those who resisted both these arguments were then sold an idea involving high military and naval strategy; they were told that we must fight because Britain and the British Navy are our first line of defense, and that without the British Navy we cannot—mind you, the most powerful nation in the world, surrounded by trackless oceans on both sides—cannot protect itself and the Western Hemisphere. Let us look at those arguments in the light of cold, hard facts, not emotional chimeras. Let us see if there exists, either in military or economic fact, or in historical fact, the slightest foundation for any of these contentions.

The invasion argument was successful to a large degree, when the lend-lease bill was sold to the country, in frightening and bludgeoning into acquiescence a people already horrified by the excesses and the chicanery of the European war and of power politics and deeply desirous of remaining aloof, trusting in their own strength to repel any invader. But that trust and that desire were, for some time, violated by the statements of men in high office, who knew better, but whose propaganda was swallowed by a people who trusted in their public servants. Now, that invasion bogey has been dispelled and routed by the irrefutable testimony of the men who know. Fortunately, I need spend little time upon the invasion bogey. I need merely point to the testimony of the Chief of Naval Operations of the United States Navy and the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. Their testimony merely corroborates and proves beyond doubt the proofs which have been advanced by so many experts in past months.

To those who have sought to argue that we faced direct invasion of the United States if Britain should fall, despite the fact that we have the largest and most powerful navy in the world, I point to the testimony of Admiral Stark on this bill:

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. The invasion of the United States has been put far in the background from where it was before that was demonstrated at Crete and Narvik?

"Admiral STARK. Yes; but I think it was pretty far in the background anyhow, because they have got to come a long distance by sea. It would take a perfectly enormous amount of tonnage, and they would have to knock the Navy out first, even before they got to the air.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. So there is not much to this talk that we hear about an invasion of the United States by Germany so long as

we have plenty of bombers and the men to man them?

"Admiral STARK. And so long as we have a naval force.

"Senator SHIPSTEAD. But, after all, they would have to sink our Navy?

"Admiral STARK. Granted your hypothesis that we have a powerful Navy and superiority in the air, I think no one can invade us." (From hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 77th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 237, a joint resolution to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes, p. 41.)

To those who admit the absence of danger of direct invasion of our shores, but who profess fear of Nazi invasion of Latin America and the use of our southern neighbors as a base for attack upon us, I say read the testimony of General Marshall only 4 months ago, when he testified on the bill for extension of selective service:

"The CHAIRMAN. General Marshall, do you consider the number of 1,418,000 men, together with the additional 152,000 of the air force, sufficient in numbers to properly defend the Western Hemisphere?

"General MARSHALL. With the addition of approximately 150,000, that I have previously discussed and under the situation as it is today; yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. That would make this approximately a total of 1,700,000 men?

"General MARSHALL. Yes, sir; approximately 1,700,000.

"The CHAIRMAN. And you deem that number sufficient to adequately defend under the present conditions?

"General MARSHALL. Under present conditions.

"The CHAIRMAN. The Western Hemisphere?

"General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. As we conceive Western Hemisphere defense?

"General MARSHALL. As I conceive it; yes, sir." (From hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, 77th Cong., 1st sess., on S. J. Res. 92 and S. J. Res. 93, p. 36.)

THE RAW MATERIALS ARGUMENT

The second argument advanced by some of the interventionists who favor butchering the Neutrality Act is that we must send our ships into belligerent territory in order to insure the delivery of needed supplies of certain raw materials. Now, even if this argument were true, which I intend to show is not the case, the fact remains that this argument has a more sinister aspect. This latter aspect was pointed out this week in the news letter *Uncensored*, which was recently praised in an editorial in the *Saturday Evening Post* as doing some very good reporting. What really occupies these so-called realists is, and I quote *Uncensored*:

"A plan to control the world by controlling the world's raw material, particularly its mineral resources. Excluding the Soviet Union, such control would be possible by an amalgamation of British, United States, and Dutch interests. The Dutch present no problem, since the British are deeply involved in their holdings and they are dependent on United States and British military assistance. The United States is in a position to obtain 51-percent control of the gigantic cartel, with the British Empire as a minority stockholder. The United States would then be the 'trustee of all nations.' It would dispense raw materials as it saw fit. The 'good nations' would be admitted into the club and would get all they needed.

"The 'bad nations' would only get raw materials for specific uses; when they became 'good' nations they would be admitted to membership, too. The chief theoretician of this scheme is Prof. William Yandell Elliott, former chairman of Harvard University's department of government and now Office of Production Management's deputy chief of

stock piles and shipping imports. Professor Elliott has the ear of the President and fills it with his ideas. Control of raw-material resources would be complemented by a plan to make similar use of 'vitamin power'—control of the world's food supplies.

"The scheme would be implemented by an Anglo-American naval force whose activities would be based not on 'freedom of the seas' but on Anglo-American 'sovereignty of the seas.' Secretary Knox's hope for Anglo-American policing of the seven seas for the next hundred years fits in well. The whole idea is already spoken of in Washington as the beginning of an 'oceanic empire.'

"The more idealistic planetarians might regard this idea simply as streamlined imperialism. But its progenitors may not be as hard-boiled as they sound. The Oceanic Empire has a joker—namely, the earth. If all nations were islands subject to naval blockade the plan might have a degree of military validity. But there are few countries which fit the plan. Suppose, skeptics point out, that 'vitamin power' or the raw-material pinch began to prove effective in some continental country—Italy, for instance. What would there be to prevent another continental country—Germany, for instance—from marching in and taking over. Not sea power, anyway. The Oceanic Empire would require a huge standing army as well as a navy to be effective on the Continents of Europe or Asia."

Thus, not only do these people want to control the world supply of raw materials through a Union Now arrangement, but they want to use the United States Navy and a world police force composed largely of American boys. What these people envision is a new world-wide imperialism, under the sweet-sounding words of the "four freedoms."

But a world imperialism, based on our need of raw materials, is not necessary. It is a false cry, as I now intend to show. The claim has been made by that great scare-monger, Douglas Miller, who is now employed in Colonel Donovan's propaganda office, that:

THE CLAIM

"If Hitler wins, we can expect * * * a growing shortage of certain critical materials, which up to now have been secured from the Old World. These shortages * * * might mean dangerous deficiencies in certain areas of our defense program and in the supply of many goods commonly used in the United States." (Douglas Miller, *You Can't Do Business With Hitler*, pp. 206-207.)

He has been answered by Hanson W. Baldwin, graduate of the United States Naval Academy and noted military expert for the *New York Times*, who wrote in his recent book on the Western Hemisphere entitled "United We Stand," that:

THE ANSWER

"Insofar as strategic raw materials, vital to the waging of war are concerned, our hemispheric self-sufficiency is, therefore, more than adequate to practically any demand." (Hanson W. Baldwin, in *United We Stand*, p. 87.)

Unfortunately, in these days of uncertainty, some Americans are prone to believe the repeated contentions of these alarmists. But examination of the facts refutes their claim.

We need not go to war for rubber or tin; American boys need not fight and die in Dong Dang or Bangkok. The Western Hemisphere is self-sufficient in terms of raw-material resources. Not only that, but we can, with some slight intelligence, and at only a small fraction of the cost of total war, build up a Western Hemisphere economy which will make the Western World impervious to the military or economic devices of any would-be dictator or world conqueror.

I propose to discuss, first, the fact that we are not reliant upon any source outside this hemisphere for any vital material; sec-

ondly, the manner in which a Western Hemisphere program can be worked out.

VITAL RAW MATERIALS—ONE BY ONE

We are strong

These resources are the iron, copper, aluminum, coal, tin, rubber, nickel, manganese, oil, and cotton (to mention a few) without which modern industry, modern living standards—and modern war—would be impossible. Actually, the United States is blessed as is no other nation in the sufficiency of its raw materials and in its capacity to convert them into necessary, useful goods. (Fleming MacLiesh and Cushman Reynolds, *Strategy of the Americas*, p. 12.)

The United States normally produces two-fifths of the world's steel (and could produce far more), three-fifths of its oil, one-third of its coal, one-third of its copper, four-fifths of its sulphur, one-quarter of its lead, three-tenths of its zinc, and sizable portions of most of the rest of the basic raw materials. (Hanson W. Baldwin, *United We Stand*, p. 311.)

Some students even think that by careful regimentation, and by the development of substitutes, the United States could be entirely, though uncomfortably, self-sufficient. But that is an extreme view. (MacLiesh and Reynolds, *ibid.*)

All here

There are some basic materials which are not produced at all in the United States, or of which insufficient quantities are produced. In the past some of these materials have been imported from Asia, Africa, and Europe as well as from Canada and Latin America. With a few minor exceptions, all of them—with proper development—can be procured within the Western Hemisphere. (MacLiesh and Reynolds, *ibid.*, p. 13; Baldwin, *ibid.*, pp. 85-87; Hubert Herring, *Good Neighbors*, pp. 343-344.)

Vital materials

The Army and Navy Munitions Board lists as strategic 14 materials "for which strict conservation and control measures" are necessary because their sources are entirely or substantially outside the continental limits of the United States. They are: Antimony, chromium, coconut shell char, manganese, manila fiber, mercury, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quinine, rubber, silk, tin, tungsten. (MacLiesh and Reynolds, *ibid.*, pp. 14-37.)

The Board also lists 15 materials as "critical" which are produced in somewhat more substantial quantities at home than the "strategic" materials or are somewhat less important in themselves. They are: aluminum, asbestos, cork, graphite, hides, iodine, kapok, opium, phenol, optical glass, platinum, tanning materials, toluol, vanadium, wool. (MacLiesh and Reynolds, *ibid.*, pp. 37-42.)

Some control has been imposed over our supplies of these materials, and steps have been taken to build up reserve supplies (stockpiles). Further, study of the available sources of these materials, one by one, shows the self-sufficiency of the Western Hemisphere. (The following information is from MacLiesh and Reynolds, *ibid.*, pp. 14-42. See also, Baldwin, *ibid.*, pp. 308-314; Herring, *ibid.*, pp. 343-344.)

Strategic

Antimony, an important steel alloy: Increased production in Mexico, Bolivia, and in the United States can negate our present reliance on China.

Chromium, another steel alloy, also required in chemical industries: Increased production in Cuba, in Brazil, where reserves are hardly touched, in Canada, and on the United States Pacific coast, could negate reliance on Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Southern Rhodesia, and the Philippines.

Coconut shell char, used for gas mask filters and other chemical appliances: Coconuts from the coasts of tropical America

would serve as well as coconuts from the Far Eastern tropics for these and other purposes—and there are substitutes.

Manganese (ferrograde), indispensable in the purification of steel: Cuba and Brazil (if her reserves were developed) could supplant the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Africa's Gold Coast, and India; and increased domestic production, already under way, will be a further help.

Manila fiber, for marine cordage: It can be grown all over Central America as easily as in the Philippines, and there are substitutes and a stockpile.

Mercury, essential in the detonators of artillery shells, in many precision instruments, and in the chemical industries: Expanded domestic production, plus increased production in Mexico and Bolivia make up for the loss of Spanish and Italian sources.

Mica, essential to radio, automotive, and aviation industries for insulation: Strategic mica can be produced in the United States, Canada, Argentina, and Brazil—though more expensively than in India and Madagascar—and there are laboratory substitutes.

Nickel, essential to armor plate: Eighty-five to ninety percent of the world's supply comes from Canada.

Quartz crystal, one type of which is essential to certain radio equipment: The strategic type comes from Brazil.

Quinine, for malaria: It can be grown in Peru and Brazil as easily as in the Netherlands Indies; there is a large stock pile, and there are two laboratory substitutes.

Strategic, too

Rubber, most dramatic of United States raw material deficiencies, is of thousandfold indispensability: Domestic consumption has already been ordered cut about 25 percent by the Office of Production Management (New York Times, June 20, 1941), but large stocks on hand, plus a growing synthetic industry, will prevent any real emergency, whatever happens in the Netherlands Indies and British Malaya. Moreover, as a long-range solution to the rubber problem, there is the slowly expanding production of Brazil, Central America, and Haiti.

Silk, for ladies' stockings and lingerie, for the powder bags for larger artillery shells, and for parachutes, comes from Japan: Further production for civilian consumption has been stopped by the Office of Production Management (New York Times, July 27, 1941), but there are stocks on hand, and nylon, rayon, and other substitutes are available. Eventually raw silk may be produced in Brazil. (Herring, *ibid.*)

Tin, only a little less dramatic than rubber, for tin cans, solders, and bearings: the Government stockpile, now slightly more than a year's requirements (Baltimore Sun, July 30, 1941), the new smelter in construction at Texas City to smelt 18,000 tons of Bolivian tin a year, the use of glass and other substitutes (New York Times, July 10, 1941)—these can offset the much publicized reliance on the Netherlands Indies and British Malaya.

Tungsten, another steel alloy: A stockpile, increased domestic production, and the new 3-year contract to buy Bolivia's entire output (New York Times, May 22, 1941) relieve worry about what would happen if the Burma Road were blocked by the Japanese and the Chinese supply cut off; moreover, molybdenum, on which the United States has a world monopoly, can be used instead.

Critical

Aluminum means airplanes and pots and pans. The present shortage is due to a lack of manufacturing capacity and to bad planning; there is enough readily extractable ore in the United States and in the Guianas in South America to make the planes, the pots, the pans.

Asbestos, for insulation against heat; it comes from Canada.

Cork probably cannot be produced in this hemisphere, but substitutes can be, and there is a stockpile.

Graphite, for foundry facings, crucibles, electrodes, lead pencils; it could be procured in Mexico and Canada instead of Ceylon, Madagascar, and Korea.

Hides: Necessary imports are procurable from Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, Canada, and elsewhere in this hemisphere where cattle are raised.

Iodine: Chile is the principal source.

Kapok, from a tree in the East Indies and Malaya, is used to stuff life preservers and furniture; it could be grown all over tropical America, and there are substitutes.

Opium: There is a stockpile.

Optical glass, for range finders, cameras, and microscopes; United States industry can produce it.

Phenol, for plastics, is made from coal tar.

Platinum, for the electrical industry: Colombia, Canada, and Alaska could produce more than we need.

Tanning materials, to make leather: They come from various parts of South America, notably Argentina.

Toluol, for TNT, is made from soft coal or petroleum.

Vanadium, another steel alloy; the United States produces half what it uses; the rest comes from Peru.

Wool, for uniforms and civilian clothes: In a pinch, expanded domestic production and increased imports from Argentina and Uruguay, could offset reliance on Australia and New Zealand, and there is a stockpile.

Progress Report

To list the Western Hemisphere sources of the "strategic" and "critical" materials is not to say that hemisphere self-sufficiency is an accomplished fact.

In Washington there has been a serious lack of raw material planning for the defense program (not to mention peacetime production).

The tangled aluminum situation is only the most conspicuous example. (Uncensored, July 19, 1941.)

Not until this summer did the Office of Production Management adopt measures to preclude dangerous shortages of tin and rubber by restricting consumption. (Uncensored, July 19, 1941; New York Times, June 20, 1941.) Hemisphere sources are only being scratched.

For instance, the difficulty of bucking the British-controlled international tin cartel in Bolivia (MacLiesh and Reynolds, *ibid.*, pp. 28-29) has prevented the building of a smelter in this country capable of turning out more than 20 percent of United States needs, despite the fact that Bolivia could produce several times that amount.

However, the Defense Supplies Corporation and the Metals Reserve Company (subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) have bought since last November and up to August 1941 250,000 tons of Latin-American copper (mostly from Chile), 300,000 tons of Chilean nitrates, and 18,000 tons of Brazilian manganese (of which production could be expanded enormously).

Huge purchases of wool and hides have already been made from Argentina and Uruguay.

The Metals Reserve Company has contracted to buy Bolivia's entire output of tungsten for 3 years, and tungsten flows in from Peru, Mexico, and Argentina. Extra zinc and lead have been bought in Latin America.

The United States recently concluded an agreement with Brazil under which the United States will for 2 years purchase Brazil's entire export surplus of rubber, titanium, nickel, iron, zirconium, bauxite (aluminum ore), industrial diamonds, mica crystals, beryllium, chromite, and manganese. The United States expects to buy Mexico's entire production of mercury and to import pig lead from Mexico, Peru, and Canada.

(Pan-American News, July 3, 1941; Uncensored, July 19, 1941.) But the flow of imports is being impeded because ships have been diverted to the British. (Washington Times-Herald, July 7, 1941; see also House hearings on H. J. Res. 77, 77th Cong., p. 9.)

Despite the slow progress in importing the vast current raw material production of Latin America and in assisting in the development of those resources toward full production, it is evident that the United States has little to fear with regard to its requirements in basic raw material wealth, even in the remote event that Hitler not only gains a military decision but also succeeds in organizing the European economy.

A HEMISPHERE PROGRAM

What is needed is the development of the necessary economic basis which must precede and undergird any adequate program of hemisphere defense.

The situation today is critical for many of the Latin-American nations. But that is not because of Nazi trade maneuvers, for Germany has been virtually eliminated from the Latin American market by the war. It is because the war and the British blockade have wiped out most of the continental European market upon which much of Latin American trade depends. Wharves are piled high with surpluses, and the inhabitants of the countries whose major exports go to Europe are feeling the pinch of a depression whose customary vigor has been fortified by the war.

But these are economic facts, not military. Economic ills must be cured by economic remedies. You cannot fight an economic fact with a battleship. There are several difficulties in the way of working out a genuine Western Hemisphere economy, of achieving hemispheric self-sufficiency. There are problems of payment, of shipping, of competition between some products of the United States and of Latin America.

No one can justly say that these problems are insoluble. It is a counsel of despair which says that we must obsequiously give our all to Britain because we fear that we cannot solve our own problems, because we must rely on others to remove a problem we dare not face. The American people reject that counsel of despair. These problems are hemisphere problems capable of being solved on this side of the Atlantic.

They pose before us a pioneering task, a task to be performed in the American way, a task calling for great energy and clear thinking. But the reward will be immeasurably great. A united effort, undertaken because it will mean more trade, higher living standards and strengthened defense for our Latin American neighbors and ourselves, will enable us to work out a true hemisphere economy freed from reliance upon the shifting winds of the Old World, a hemisphere pattern geared to the needs of 1941.

In this effort our Latin American neighbors will gladly join, for, as administration spokesmen have repeatedly assured us, the people of Latin America are united with us in their whole-hearted opposition to totalitarianism. But we must be prepared to work with them in a joint venture. To quote Secretary of the Navy Knox (writing before his appointment in the Atlantic Monthly for July 1939), "We must quit patronizing them. It goes down as badly with them as British patronizing does with us."

The war has brought America a God-given opportunity. Practically the whole of Europe is now closed to Latin America as a market as well as a source of supplies. For the duration of the war, Germany and the European nations she controls, are cut off from the Western Hemisphere. "Latin America is one of the large trading regions left in the world where outside nations may still invest and carry on commerce more or less on an equal footing." (Pan America, by Carleton Beals, p. 893.)

Great Britain, since she controls the seas, can continue trading. But because Britain is preoccupied with production for war, she may be unable to supply the Latin American demand for many commodities. The United States is in a position to fulfill such demands. We are in a position to strengthen the economic dependence of the Latin American nations on us, both as a market and as a source of supplies. We have the opportunity, now while Europe is preoccupied with events east of the Atlantic, to establish a stake in Latin America that will be permanent and fruitful.

One of the best reasons for cultivating economic relations with Latin American nations is to make sure that, in the event the worst happens and Britain goes down, we will have in this hemisphere a well-established and working interdependence between the nations north and south. If our Western Hemisphere economy is so arranged that peoples can sell their products, can have a reasonable standard of living, a Nazi-dominated Europe will not have much to offer in the way of inducement to capture the Latin American market.

A PROGRAM FOR A HEMISPHERE ECONOMY

What positive program must we follow in the Western Hemisphere to avoid European dominance? The problem has many aspects, but the two basic requirements are that we solve the surplus problem and that we find some way of raising living standards.

THE ECONOMICS OF HEMISPHERE DEFENSE

All-American front—Arms not enough

Vice President Henry A. Wallace has declared that, "The American Republics can minimize the possibility of ultimate military attack if they unify their economic power." (Economic Union for the America's, University of Chicago Round Table, June 30, 1940.)

The theory of military defense for the Western Hemisphere has already been endorsed by 86 percent of the people. (Gallup poll, Washington Post, May 14, 1941.) But it is axiomatic that nations tend to throw their military weight on the side of those countries with which their economic interests are identified. Therefore, a hemisphere economic plan must evolve by which the United States satisfies, to a far greater degree than heretofore, the trade needs of Latin America. Otherwise, the nations to the south will be forced into the hands of European and Asiatic dictators.

Now, with European trade cut off by the war, the opportunity has come to weld together, once and for all, the economies of North and South America. Such a program will not be achieved without sacrifice on our part, but the long-term dividends will far outweigh the immediate cost.

I wish to discuss (1) problems arising out of Latin-American trade with the United States, and with Europe; (2) present obstacles in the way of increased inter-American trade; (3) proposed plans for an integrated Western Hemisphere economy; and, (4) steps already taken for inter-American cooperation.

World Market

Latin America as a whole operates on a semi-colonial economy. (Fortune, December, 1937.) That is, its raw materials are produced—largely by foreign capital—shipped to industrial Europe or the United States, processed into manufactured articles, and finally sold back into the world market. Obviously then, Latin American nations are in general dependent, for their foreign exchange, upon the world prices of raw materials. (The Foreign Trade of Latin America, United States Tariff Commission, Part 1, pp. 44, 45.) When the world price for Latin American raw material exports is low, our neighbors to the south have less money with which to buy the exports of the United States and other

exporting nations, and also lack exchange to apply on their foreign debts.

Latin America Must Sell

It is essential that total exports from Latin America exceed total imports into that area if (1) she is to be able to pay for her imports, (2) pay interest on her already large debts to foreign governments and foreign banks, (3) pay for shipping services which are now almost entirely in the hands of non-Latin American nations. Other than exports, there are three main ways by which Latin America has been assisted in meeting her outside obligations: (1) Money spent by travelers in Latin America; (2) disbursements in Latin America by foreign-owned concerns; (3) shipment of gold and silver to the United States. (Ibid., p. 98.)

Trade with Europe and United States

In the past Latin America, as a whole, has had a greater trade with continental Europe, as a whole, than with the United States. (Ibid., p. 39.) There are two obvious reasons for such a situation. In the first place Latin America is one of the great food baskets for Europe, whereas the United States is relatively self-sufficient in foodstuffs. (Foreign Commerce Weekly, Feb. 15, 1941.) In the second place, the prices of raw materials which Latin America sells have tended to fall faster than the prices of our manufactured goods. (Fortune, September 1940.) The inevitable result was that Latin America became more and more short of foreign exchange. Nevertheless, in all but 2 of the 10 years from 1929 to 1939, the value of the goods the United States bought from Latin America has been greater than the value of the goods Latin America bought from us. (Foreign Trade of Latin America, p. 98.) Moreover, the United States has been the largest single buyer of Latin American materials and the largest single seller to Latin America. (Ibid., p. 40.) In 1938, for instance, the United States took 30 percent of Latin American exports; United Kingdom took 17 percent; and Germany, despite her much publicized trade drive, took only 11 percent. (Ibid., p. 39.) In the same year the United States supplied Latin America with 34 percent of her imports; United Kingdom supplied 12 percent; and Germany only 16 percent. (Ibid., p. 40.)

Shortsighted United States

There are two less obvious causes tending to hurt United States trade with Latin America. The first reason is our slipshod buying methods. For instance, before the present European War it was almost impossible to buy American dollars in Uruguay. Our trade was stymied. This situation came about because one year we would buy up the entire output of wool. The next year, if wool was a fourth of a cent cheaper in Australia, we would buy practically none from Uruguay. Consequently Uruguay preferred to make 5-year barter deals with Germany and Italy because of the guaranty of definite long-term production. This was the only way to avoid periodic anarchy in one of Uruguay's major industries. Mexico and Argentina have made similar protests about our hit-or-miss trade policies. (Carleton Beals, Pan America, p. 305.)

The second factor holding back United States trade with Latin America results partially from the above-mentioned trade policies. In the past the Axis nations either concluded barter agreements whereby the amount of products traded had equal value, thereby leaving no financial residue, or if a specific barter trade resulted in an Axis nation owing some monetary balance to a Latin American country, the monetary balance was paid in "aski" money—that is, money which could be used only in the purchase of other goods from the same Axis nation. Thus despite the increase in South American trade with Axis nations during the depression, no more dollar exchange was available with which to pur-

chase goods from the United States. Likewise, payments for imports from Latin America by the British Empire are made in "blocked" sterling—that is, money which is only good for the purchase of products made in countries belonging to the sterling bloc, consisting mainly of the territories making up the British Empire. (Foreign Commerce Weekly, February 15, 1941.)

To the extent that Latin American countries sell their goods to countries using "blocked" currencies (in effect, bilateral trade agreements), the opportunity for other nations to increase their sales in the markets of Latin America will be materially reduced. (Foreign Trade of Latin America, p. 103.)

Priorities in the way

Moreover, of late we have placed obstacles in our own path. These grew out of the confusion within the present administration in Washington as to where the aid-to-Britain program ends and where our own hemisphere defense program begins. The nature of the impediments can be described in one word—"priorities." Price Administrator Leon Henderson and former Office of Production Management Priorities Director Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., have objected to shipping steel, machinery, chemicals, etc., to Latin America, contending that these products were sorely needed right here at home. (Newsweek, July 21, 1941.)

Among other duties, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs Nelson Rockefeller's committee within the Office for Emergency Management is directed to "formulate, recommend, and execute programs in the commercial and economic fields which, by the effective use of governmental and private facilities, will further the commercial well-being of the Western Hemisphere." (Executive order, July 30, 1941.) Nevertheless, he has flatly stated: "The front line (of the defense program) is the aid-to-England program. The second line of defense is the hemisphere program." (Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 77th Cong., on the second deficiency appropriation bill for 1941, p. 688.)

Ships needed

Such an attitude does not augur well for the solution of the most pressing of all the immediate problems, namely, the bottleneck in ships because of our lease-lend program, which provides for the release to Britain of 2,000,000 tons of United States shipping. (How the tanker part of this ship-transfer scheme has created an oil shortage in the United States was described in Did You Know, No. 18.) In addition, the Navy requisitioned 15 new freighters from the Moore-McCormack Lines pan-American run. This was the greatest number of ships demanded from any foreign-run line. It is not at all surprising that the resulting ship shortage facing Brazil and Uruguay has created the prospect of coal rationing in those countries, despite the fact that there is plenty of bituminous coal waiting at Virginia ports. Moreover, this summer shipments at Buenos Aires and Montevideo were 3 months in arrears; and although Brazilian manganese is needed in our own defense program, the manganese was piling up on Brazilian docks. Unless some new and stern authority is put behind the Latin American drive, inter-American economic relations seem due for still further disruption. For the United States giant ship-building effort will further tighten up priorities on the steel and machinery desired by the Latins. (Newsweek, July 21, 1941.)

Home trade needed

Due largely to the nature of their products, the inadequate intracontinental transportation facilities, and to the early established overseas connections, the trade between Latin American nations themselves

has heretofore been relatively small. In the aggregate, the 20 nations of Latin America had furnished the markets for less than 10 percent of each other's exports. (Foreign Commerce Weekly, February 15, 1941.) Another factor operating here is that only a small aristocratic fringe of the population ever sees cash income as high as \$1,000 a year, while over 50 percent of Latin American families probably live on less than \$100 cash income a year. (Duncan Aikman, Survey Graphic, March 1941.)

Seven trading nations

The import and export trade of Latin America is largely concentrated in 7 of the 20 nations. These countries are: Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Mexico, Cuba, Chile, and Colombia. In fact, these countries accounted for 85 percent of total Latin American exports in both 1938 and 1939. The 10 countries south of Panama customarily account for over 75 percent of all Latin American imports. The United States customarily takes about one-third of all Latin American exports and supplies approximately the same percentage of Latin American imports. (Foreign Trade of Latin America, pp. 31, 32, 36, 37, 39, 40.)

Trade bonds with United States

A hasty statement to the effect that a unified Europe would automatically control Latin America's foreign trade simply ignores trade statistics. For instance, when regional trade figures are examined the importance of trade with the United States, in relation to total trade (import and export combined), is seen to average approximately 50 percent in the Caribbean area. (Foreign Trade of Latin America, p. 46.) Significantly, these are the countries closest to the United States and they guard the vital defense areas of the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Panama Canal. On a trade basis, it is clear that a Hitler Europe would have a hard time persuading these countries that their economic welfare did not rest on cooperation with the United States. Moreover, in vital Brazil, trade with the United States constitutes nearly 30 percent of the total; in west coast South American countries—Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru—nearly 25 percent; and in east coast countries—Argentina, Paraguay, and Uruguay—over 10 percent. (Foreign Trade of Latin America, pp. 46, 47.) This then is the over-all trade picture of Latin America.

Argentine problems

But Latin America is not a unit. Latin America is 20 countries, each with problems of its own. Space limits us to only a brief glance at the two largest countries—Argentina and Brazil. The difference between their economic problems demonstrates that Latin America is not a unit. A dramatic picture of a hemisphere economic stumbling block is given by Duncan Aikman. (Survey Graphic, March 1941.) He tells of a 4,000,000-ton corn surplus in Argentina which cannot be moved because Europe is blockaded—and which threatens 27,000 railroad workers with unemployment. He tells of a 400,000,000-bushel Argentine wheat surplus cut off from its normal European market. At the same time the United States itself has unsalable export surpluses of wheat (150,000,000 bushels) and corn. In Argentina, those who desire a working hemisphere economy discover the knottiest problem. For in 1938 Argentina sold 52 percent of her exports to European powers and only 9 percent to the United States. (Hubert Herring, Good Neighbors, p. 344.) Since the United States cannot furnish an outlet for these food surpluses, Argentina's overproduction constitutes a permanent problem to be handled by those who would devise an economic plan for the hemisphere. Whether this food surplus must be sold only in Europe is another question which is considered below.

Bonds with Brazil

Brazil is on the other side of the trade statistics fence. In relation to total trade (import and export combined), trade with the United States makes up virtually 30 percent. (Foreign Trade of Latin America, p. 47.) In the past coffee has been the major Brazilian export to the United States. (Ibid., p. 54.) But Brazil is the principal present, and potential, source of strategic raw materials in Latin America. (Carleton Beals, Survey Graphic, March 1941.) As a supplier of these vital raw materials Brazil furnishes a large share of the key to military defense of the hemisphere. (MacLiesh and Reynolds, Strategy of the Americas, pp. 43, 44.)

PROPOSED PLANS AND STEPS ALREADY TAKEN

What to do

Some proposed programs for the economic defense of the Western Hemisphere assume, in varying degrees, that a world revolution in trade methods is now gradually taking place. Huge continental trading groups buying and selling the products of many nations through one agency are envisaged by some as the only method of assuring equality of treatment to small nations which, by themselves, are in a relatively disadvantageous bargaining position. Such is the view of Dr. Carlos Davila, former provisional President of Chile and former Chilean Ambassador to the United States. He declares that continental monopoly of foreign trade is the only method of saving hemisphere markets for the United States. (How Should We Meet Totalitarian Aggression in the Americas? Town Meeting of the Air, November 25, 1940.)

World trade problems

Even before the present European war the so-called free flow of multilateral trade had been interrupted by (1) bilateral trade agreements; (2) outright barter agreements with Axis nations; (3) absence of the gold standard, and of any one accepted world monetary standard, with the result that gold could not be used to settle international trade balances; (4) uneasy state of world affairs resulting in an upset of international credits. (Adolf A. Berle, Jr., New Directions in the New World, p. 39.)

Buy the surpluses?

Duncan Aikman suggests two plans, of which the first would be a highly expensive, but relatively simple, emergency program utilizing the cartel system. This system calls on the United States to buy up stocks of everything which the Germans could possibly demand in Latin America, at prices, in cash or barter, better than the Germans could pay. (Usually proponents of this system state that the cash which the United States would pay Latin America would be good only for the purchase of United States, or at least Western Hemisphere, products.) Aikman contends that we could sell the stocks to Europe at our own terms, or give them away to distressed populations in the Western Hemisphere, or sink them in the ocean. (Survey Graphic, March 1941.) Establishment of a hemispheric surplus commodities corporation is reported to be under consideration by agricultural officials. (Washington Star, August 17, 1941.) But Carleton Beals, who, according to Time magazine, is "now the best informed living writer on Latin America," opposes both the cartel plan and such modifications of it as have been suggested. "The problems are too complex, the nature of the countries and their governments too divergent. . . . A general goal and plan are possible, but the details should be fluid and dependent upon circumstances." (Pan America, p. 428.)

New tactics needed

However, Beals agrees that we can no longer permit the illusion of a pacific world of free intercourse (as postulated by the Hull reciprocal trade treaties) to block the establishment of our true security. (Ibid., p. 495.)

Neither can we continue to make irresponsible loans to other countries with which they buy our own goods (and those of our potential enemies). (Ibid., p. 495.)

Build up Latin America?

Beals suggests the following economic program for the hemisphere (ibid., pp. 506, 507, 508, 513, 514):

1. An economic plan based on mutual benefit.

2. Promotion of production of strategic materials as near to the United States as possible. These raw-product industries must be controlled by (and eventually owned by) the country in which they are located, or by native capital. Investments by our Government or by our private capital should be for a limited period, with guaranties of eventual transferral. (In 1939, Davila outlined such a long-range solution to the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee. His plan called for the setting up of corporations with mixed United States and Latin American capital, whose main function would be to develop in Latin American countries new fields of mineral, agricultural, and industrial production which would not compete with the production of the United States. (How Should We Meet Totalitarian Aggression in the Americas? p. 9.)

3. Loans to be made only for specific industries (not un earmarked sums to governments). These industries should usually be complementary to, not competitive with, our own. (Aikman believes that a sound hemisphere defense industry development program would, by increasing the purchasing power of Latin Americans, also help to relieve the food surplus problems. (Survey Graphic, March 1941.)

4. Utilization of new trade methods, such as guaranteed trade quotas and prices, organized purchasing power, tariff reductions, and rebates, preferential tariffs, long-term agreements and contracts, even buying subsidies.

5. The setting aside of a percentage of tariff receipts from Latin American products to provide funds for preliminary scientific research, technical supervision, sanitation, the further development of rubber plantations, etc.

A mutual-benefit plan

Such a program would raise the living standards of the Latin American people so that they would gradually emancipate themselves from dictatorships; a larger market would be created for American goods; a greater interchange of commodities would take place between the Latin American countries, thus lessening the degree of their pre-war economic dependence on Europe and the Orient. Thus, we would have secured for ourselves the strategic materials which we are now forced to buy at exorbitant prices from the British and Dutch Empires. At the same time we would strengthen our economic bonds with our southern neighbors and minimize any totalitarian economic threat. However, the Argentine beef and wheat surpluses, and the Brazilian cotton surpluses, should, Beals feels, be allowed to reach their natural outlets in Europe and in the Orient. Under the plan discussed above, these purchases would not be sufficient to wean Latin American nations away from the democratic bloc.

Free trade?

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, urges businessmen to concentrate less on maintaining a favorable balance of trade, and realize anew that other nations can buy from us only if we buy from them. (As pointed out earlier, this postulate is increasingly true in the present era of bilateral and totalitarian trade agreements.) Berle, maintaining firmly his faith that the day of free commerce will return, states the obvious

when he says that we must back this faith by evolving a mechanism for temporary exchange credits. In the case of countries where there is no prospect of an immediate balance of trade, Berle would have the United States extend long-term credits until those nations become financially stronger. Indeed, he would prefer that the powers of the Export-Import Bank be expanded so that the individual American exporter is financed by the bank, allowing the ultimate risk of payment to fall on the national resources. (Adolf A. Berle, Jr., *New Directions in the New World*, pp. 39-43.)

What's been done?—Loans

That popular person known as the man on the street, and high Government officials in both North and South America, talk constantly of hemisphere defense. What has actually been done on the economic front? (Except where otherwise noted, the following information is taken from *Foreign Commerce Weekly*, September 6, 1941.) Inasmuch as money is the oil which makes the economic gears mesh, it is important to examine the work of the Export-Import Bank. Since the beginning of the European war this Government agency has loaned over \$255,000,000 in the Western Hemisphere, all but \$25,000,000 of which has gone to Latin America. The Bank has authorized loans to all the southern countries except Bolivia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico. Latin American countries receiving loans in excess of \$20,000,000 are, in order of size of loan: Brazil, Argentina, Cuba, Chile, and Colombia. Loans have been made for the improvement of highways and railroads; for the purchase of United States agricultural and industrial machinery, and for the creation of public utilities. A loan has been made for the large-scale production of commercial rubber in Haiti. The latter program means a rise in the living standards of our southern friends and consequently a greater ability to buy ever-increasing amounts of the exports of the United States. Moreover, it is an industry which will produce products which we formerly had to buy from sources outside the hemisphere. Finally, increased prosperity in Latin America assures the repayment of the loans extended by our Government. Both the Export-Import Bank and the Treasury have made loans for the purpose of stabilizing the shaky currencies of some Latin American nations. The fly in the gravy of the Export-Import loans is that the Latin-American nations have so far been able to spend only \$92,000,000. The correct name for the fly is priorities. Because United States industry is glutted with lease-lend orders for Britain, China, and Russia, as well as for our own defense effort, Latin American orders have more or less fallen by the wayside. Some attempt is now being made by the Department of Commerce to place Latin American orders with some of the small business houses in the United States. It remains to be seen how far the lease-lend program will be allowed to stab in the back our attempt at building a hemisphere economy. (Newsweek, September 22, 1941.) It has been charged that too many of the Export-Import loans have been made primarily with an eye to increasing the exportation of United States heavy goods to Latin America, and too few loans made for the development of products complementing United States economy. (Foreign Policy Reports, June 15, 1941.)

What's been done?—Trade

The shipping shortage has been helped somewhat by an agreement utilizing for inter-American trade some 80 Axis-controlled ships hitherto immobilized in Latin American harbors. A quota system has been adopted by the coffee-producing nations in order to maintain a stable price structure. Similar arrangements are in the offing among the cacao and wheat-producing countries. Exports to the United States have been

greatly increased mainly because of the raw material buying program which is part of our rearmament effort. In the first 6 months of 1941 United States imports from Latin America had a greater value than the imports for the full year of 1938. Although in 1940, United States imports from Latin America were up \$170,000,000 over 1938, the increase was almost wholly accounted for by imports of gold. (Washington Star, September 16, 1941.) Such imports contribute little to a sound economic program for the Hemisphere. On the plus side of the raw-material ledger is the fact that Brazil has already banned the export of defense materials to all countries except the United States. (Washington Post, June 19, 1941.) Somewhat similar arrangements have either been concluded or are in the discussion stage with several other Latin American nations. (New York Times, September 19, 1941.) Inter-American trade has been completely withdrawn from the hands of pro-Axis traders by President Roosevelt's proclamation of a blacklist.

What's been done?—Raw materials

The Department of Agriculture has undertaken exploratory surveys in Latin America looking toward the greater development of tropical agriculture. This is particularly significant because products grown in this area would be almost wholly complementary to the agricultural products of the United States. Moreover, there is tremendous room for expansion in this field because more than two-thirds of Latin America lies within the Tropical Zone. (M. W. Williams, *The People and Politics of Latin America*, p. 2.) The Inter-American Development Commission, with national councils in each of the South American countries, is making continuous studies aimed at developing Latin American industrialization in those fields for which the United States is now forced to look to other continents. Thus we see that while halting steps have been taken in the right direction, to date the surface has hardly been scratched.

AFTER THE WAR

The suggestions made so far have dealt with actions that could be taken now without reliance upon either German or a British victory. What of the future? Regardless of who wins the war, we may be certain that purchasing power in European countries will be greatly reduced as a result of impoverishment resulting from the war. It will be some time after the war ends before those countries which represent the principal potential outlets for our products can once more take up production of the goods they must have to exchange for our products. It is also certain that many restrictive controls, begun in the early thirties and continued with increasing intensity up to the outbreak of the war, will go on. Government will continue to exercise direct control over foreign trade.

IF BRITAIN WINS

Another certain thing is that even if Britain wins a military victory she will suffer defeat on other fronts, which will make it necessary for us to reexamine our entire relationship—military, economic, and political—to the British Empire. Britain will no longer have a stranglehold on much of the world's resources; her historic policy of controlling the balance of power on the Continent, and thus preventing the unification of Europe, is now out of date; her policy of insisting that unsound economic units be preserved for political reasons must now yield to the pressure of events; her dominance of the seaways can no longer be continued without challenge.

If Britain wins, we can expect a real scramble for markets in Latin America on her part. Her normal industries, which to a large extent have been diverted to production of war goods, will need to be adjusted once more to peacetime production. She will be impoverished to an incredible degree, because it is generally conceded that Britain can win only

after a long war. And we need not delude ourselves into expecting that Britain will respect what we might consider our prior rights in Latin America just because we came to her aid in the generous manner authorized in the terms of the lease-lend bill.

If Germany wins, there can be no doubt that Germany would be a formidable economic rival. She will try to reorganize Europe into a single economic unit and may eventually succeed. Individually, the nations of the Western Hemisphere might be hard put to it to compete with a new Germany. But if they act together for their common economic defense as they are now preparing to do for their political and military defense, there can be no doubt that they can maintain and strengthen their economic and political independence. This contention is based on the fact that we now have a breathing spell—with England occupied in Europe with Germany completely out of the trade picture in this hemisphere—in which to put down our stakes and establish the sound basis for a real Western Hemisphere economy. We must make the best use we can of this period at our disposal. We cannot assume that the Latin American governments will cooperate with the United States in seeking for ways to avoid reliance on whatever market Germany offers after the war for sentimental reasons. In the period from now until the end of the war, we must act so as to make it good business and good statesmanship for the Latin American nations to continue to cooperate with us.

IF GERMANY WINS

To those obsessed with the hysterical fear that Germany may win the war in a short time and may immediately launch an irresistible trade drive in Latin America, it need merely be said that they ignore the facts. Even in peacetime, when Germany was free to push her trade devices, she made no serious inroads upon American trade. Such gains as she made were largely at the expense of Great Britain. Those gains, in addition, were made because Germany offered a market for surplus products. Even in a very short time, the proposed hemispheric program can be put under way, and results will quickly be forthcoming. Increased production and trade can soon stimulate consumption, so that troublesome surpluses can be assimilated. Strongly in our favor is the fact that at the end of the long war that will have been fought, Germany will be so spent economically, so occupied with policing the whole of conquered Europe, so concerned with preserving her dominance against any possible Russian ambitions, that she will be in no position to undertake a bold new adventure in the Western Hemisphere.

If the next step in world alignments is a group of economic blocs, a self-sufficient bloc can be formed in the Western Hemisphere which will possess greater resources and will offer the opportunity for a higher standard of living than any other competitive group.

If, in the years immediately ahead we move forward on the basis of a constructive program which takes into account the welfare of all the American nations, the American republics will be entirely able to resist any kind of economic invasion a Nazi-dominated Europe can attempt. No economic pressure from Europe could break down our united front.

"If our trade is to reach a higher level on the basis of a healthy exchange of goods, new methods, patient experimentation, and a long-range policy will be necessary. It will also be necessary to abandon many cherished American practices and to concentrate our buying now not on unneeded products but on vitally needed materials, and to promote greater reciprocity, not so much of trade as of actual production. This is all part of the larger question whether we can help build a real community of nations in the Western Hemisphere.

"At present the incentive to create such a community, based on fair play, is strong. Strife in Asia and Europe is creating special relationships among the 21 American republics. Bonds severed with Europe now mean new, if temporary, strong ties among the American peoples. They are again being forced into closer economic, political, and cultural alignments.

"The problem today is whether the United States can avoid old mistakes and whether, in conjunction with our Latin American neighbors, we can construct an economic, political, and moral system—a new western front that will stand the shocks of war and the fierce competition that will follow the war; a system that will be of mutual advantage to all the nations concerned and strong enough to hold its own with the great trading empires elsewhere." (Pan America, by Carleton Beals, p. 407.)

To those who are skeptical of the feasibility of such a program it need only be said that we have little choice. To choose the other course, the course toward war, is to commit suicide. Even should we win a clear-cut military victory, there will be nothing but chaos and destruction. The hope for a peaceful and prosperous America would yield to the harsh but inescapable reality of large-scale unemployment, cut-throat competition for trade, and recurring depressions. We should understand that well, who lost the temporary prosperity of the years 1914-17 in a prolonged postwar crisis.

SOLVING OUR OWN PROBLEMS, TOO

The program I have outlined for the Western Hemisphere cannot but be beneficial to us. Moreover:

"We must not let the news of war obscure the fact that the United States is still burdened with a large volume of unemployment, and that we cannot attain the full stature of economic strength until we have the full utilization of our human resources. We have in this country surplus funds which are seeking outlets for investment, and it seems that the utilization of some of these funds for investments in Latin America would be as beneficial to this country as they promise to be there. As has been noted above, experience indicates that when we can increase our national income to the point of full employment, our trade opportunities will also expand, and no insurmountable transfer problems should arise." (War and Our Latin American Trade Policy, 1939, p. 233.)

In closing, let me read you a moving passage from the article by Pare Lorenz which appeared in the February 1941 issue of McCall's Magazine:

"We are in need of a new generation of pioneers, a generation to settle and hold the New World. We have many things to learn from our neighbors—patience, a high sense of honor, an ancient knowledge of form, and color and architecture, an abstract intellectual curiosity.

"We have many things to bring them—a mechanical and gadget genius, a restless, impatient knack of organization, medical and scientific knowledge.

"We can do it only in the way we shoved railroads through unoccupied deserts and over glacier peaks, the way we laid out city limits in the empty sagebrush country, the way men and women of the Oregon Trail took their wagons apart, rafted rapids, lowered themselves down canyons with ropes, and kept going until they hit the Pacific.

"We can do it if we throw our resource reports and our income reports and our estimates of our own power out the window, and live up to our real potential of men and machines and materials, without worrying about the economy and theory of the sick and decayed Old World.

"We can do it only if we keep alive the legends and the faiths of the men who made us great, if we take into the Americas a belief that if a poor dirt farmer's son became the

greatest leader in our history, it is our obligation to see that the son of any citizen of the Americas, whether Indian, Spanish, Portuguese, or mestizo, shall have an equal opportunity to become a leader of his people."

EXHIBIT 2

PROPAGANDA

SUCKERS FOR SLOGANS

Philosophers and politicians have agreed throughout the ages that the mind of man in the mass is a curious instrument, and in no way more curious than in its unbelievable susceptibility to the magic of words, to the siren song of slogans, and propaganda. But we all recall the old proverb that "a burnt child dreads the fire." If there is one fact which the entire American people have recognized for the past 20 years, it is the fact that we, the people of America, were sorely burnt in the fire of the World War. All too late, we recognized that the power of words, the magic of propaganda, had sold us in 1917 the idea that the World War blood bath was a war of righteousness and light against the forces of evil. Throughout this broad land men and women vowed that never again would we become suckers for slogans, that never again would we squander American blood and wealth in the eternally recurring squabbles of Europe.

The people of America, the great mass of toilers by hand and brain, learned that lesson well, so well that 80 percent of them have uniformly and persistently opposed American participation as a belligerent in this European war, although all wish and hope for the victory of Britain. That wish and that hope arise out of deep antipathy to the despicable doctrine of Nazi-ism. It does not arise out of any belief of the people that this European war is our war, or any feeling that the war is a black-and-white struggle of the forces of good against the forces of evil. The people who fought and bled and paid in the World War were too well burned to fall for old slogans under streamlined new captions.

But the war party in this land has apparently fallen once more for the siren songs of British propaganda. The war party is small in numbers but its members are strategically placed in our Government and in our agencies for the transmission of ideas. They can do and have already done a damage to the faith of our people and to our structure of constitutional government far out of proportion to their strength. The existence and composition of this war party demonstrates the fact that the British propaganda agencies themselves use a "fifth column" technique very much like the "fifth column" technique of the Nazis. Like the Nazi technique, the British technique has been to win over a small number of prominent individuals, strategically placed in our governmental and propaganda structure.

In this there is a striking similarity, as I shall point out, to the British propaganda techniques during the World War. Yet there is this difference from the World War. Because of the very effective educational work for the past 20 years of the numerous organizations comprising what one observer has called the British network, the ground was laid for the siren songs this time. But, in contrast with the situation as it existed in the early years of the World War, now the administration itself has encouraged and fostered the mythology of the good war, as I shall point out.

We all recall how strongly propagandists sought to persuade the American people that we must fight because otherwise we would be invaded, or Latin America would furnish a base for invasion activities directed against us. That argument, as I and others have shown, lacked any basis in the face of the testimony of experts. Then a shift was made to the claim that our foreign trade would be

crippled and our way of life would collapse before a Nazi Europe. That claim, too, was ridiculed out of existence by the genuine economists. So, in desperation, the propagandists shifted once more—this time to the familiar, but oh so appealing, slogan of the holy crusade. There are those among us, and many of them are in high places, who cherish within their bosoms messianic ideas, and who believe that our way of life must be forced upon the rest of the world, willing or not. There are others so overwhelmed with admiration for the noblesse oblige spirit which they think is exemplified by the British ruling class and the British Empire, that they can visualize no catastrophe half so terrible as impairment of the power and influence of the empire. These variegated minds were "duck soup" for the holy crusade theory.

But how shall we explain the forces which have caused so many Members of the Congress of the United States, experienced men, versed in the ways of nations and rulers, to change their minds, so that now they urge our entry into the war, or are willing to support measures whose necessary result will be to cause that entry?

SIREN SONG OF PROPAGANDA

"This is our war."

"This is a struggle between two worlds, between the free way of life and the slave way of life."

"We cannot survive unless we fight now."

"Our front-line trenches lie in London."

"The British Navy is our first line of defense."

"Great Britain is fighting for our way of life."

"If Britain falls, the United States falls."

These are the words and phrases that have been pounded, ceaselessly pounded, into the ears of the American people.

The very walls of this Chamber have resounded with these same words and phrases vehemently expounded by those Senators who have demanded the passage of the lend-lease bill, and of all the steps toward war which have followed that bill.

When I cite statements made by Members of this body, and seek to understand or explain those statements, let it be clear that I cast no reflection upon any Member of this body, nor do I impugn the motives which have led him to change his mind. I cite those statements merely as typical examples, to be analyzed in the light of the facts as we know them.

"We will fight," shouted Senator AUSTIN. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1057.)

And again the senior Senator from Vermont cried out: "No sneers can shake my belief that the United States of America is in imminent peril of invasion if Britain falls." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1041.)

On what does the Senator base that belief? How has he come by that belief? What have been the forces playing upon his mind that have created that belief within him?

Senator HILL asserts that all will be well "as long as Britain survives and the British Navy continues to hold the gateways of the Atlantic." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1166.)

Throwing fear into the hearts of the uninformed, Senator MURRAY charges, "If Hitler wins, he will dominate the international trade and commerce of the world." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1351.)

Closing a long speech, Senator LUCAS drew a long, drawn-out gruesome picture of all the things that are going to happen to us "if Great Britain falls." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1615.)

On what do these Senators base all these heart-rending predictions about what will happen to us as a result of events taking place thousands of miles away from us, events with which they have had no personal contact? What have been the forces playing upon the minds of these Senators that causes them to resort to a technique comparable, and similar to that used by Senators on this

floor during those tragic days immediately prior to our participation in the former World War?

Senator BAILEY confessed here 6 months ago that in October 1939 he admitted on this floor that this war "is not our war"; then he added, "I have utterly changed my mind about this situation. * * * I am advocating intervention. * * * I am hoping that intervention may not mean war, but I am ready if intervention does mean war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1162.)

What has changed Senator BAILEY's mind? What forces have been playing upon the Senator's mind to make him change from this "is not our war" to an advocacy of intervention even if it does mean war? What ideas are molding the mental processes of those Senators who are advocating the passage of this repeal of the combat zones, even to the point of war?

Senator CONNALLY has taken a thread out of this carefully woven pattern or design when he proclaims from the floor here, "Nazism and fascism have leagued their might to enforce with fire and the sword their wills upon the existing world." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1152.)

And let us not overlook the senior Senator from Florida who, if Hitler should die, would have nothing left to talk about. He would be deprived of his favorite subject of conversation. Let us not overlook Senator PEPPER, who, just a few months ago, admitted that at the beginning of this war he felt "rather indulgent," and was not particularly perturbed about the more or less usual European practices (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1057) of trying to kill each other off; but now, just listen to how he feels now: "America will not let England fall. * * * If the action now proposed will not save England, we will save it anyway." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1058.)

In other words, if this bill does not save England, he is going to see that she is saved anyway. Well, just how does he propose to do it? If the Senator from Florida can't save England by the passage of this bill, does he propose to throw a vast American army into Europe, or into the Orient, to save Britain's far-eastern commercial and financial stake in the opium trade and other activities? Does he propose to throw an American army over into Africa in the hope that it can roll up into Europe through the back door, and thus preserve England's domination of the European Continent?

Senator PEPPER says that we are going to save England anyway. Well, how else does he expect to do it?

And what has brought Senator PEPPER into this belligerent frame of mind? He admitted that he was not concerned about this war when it broke out. Then, with language that was lurid and dramatic, he tried to scare us with a grand array of hobgoblins, to force the passage of the lend-lease bill, and to give the comforting assurance to the American people that "if the action now proposed will not save England, we will save it, anyway."

That sounds like war in any man's language.

What has changed Senator PEPPER from an attitude of indifference to an insistence upon war, if necessary, to gain his end?

Can it be that there are subtle propaganda forces at work in this country to lead us into the war on behalf of Britain? Can it be that Senators have been victimized by propaganda, as they were in 1917? Are these forces at work now, as they were in the olden days?

As a power in influencing the lives of men and women, and thus determining the course of nations, propaganda is a force to conjure with.

Why do we think as we do? Why do we behave as we do? How do you know what's right and wrong? Where did you get the idea? Most of our ideas come from someone

else. Not many of us see things for ourselves. We are born blind and come to see things that others have seen first and have pointed out to us.

We speak of our ideas, but they are mostly things that somebody has pointed out to us—maybe honestly, maybe dishonestly.

Then, when we combine some of these ideas with some cherished prejudices and dress them up in words we have learned from someone else, the result of this mixture we proudly parade as our opinion, and someone has well described an opinion as a generalization that has been arrived at from an incomplete investigation prematurely stopped.

But opinion rolls on and on. Momentous decisions involving life and death of individuals and nations are made on no more than that type of opinion. Opinion as made comes to us in waves or like an infection. If we go into this war, "it will be because we have caught the war fever," John Foster Dulles declared in an address before the New York meeting of the National Economic Club and published in their consensus of May 1939.

Mr. Dulles, as you know, is the senior member of a great American law firm, was counsel to the American Peace Commission at Versailles, a member of the Reparations Commission, and author of War, Peace and Change.

Continuing his address, Mr. Dulles said: "If our policy were based upon a genuine understanding of the causes of the present crisis and was intelligently designed to achieve a world order whereby recurrent crises might hereafter be avoided," demand for action might be justified.

"Unfortunately," he added, "this prerequisite to affirmative action seems * * * to be nonexistent. * * * I do not find in our public opinion, official or private, any comprehension of the true nature of the problem. Our reactions seem to me to be impulsive and emotional, wholly lacking either that intellectual content or that idealism which alone would justify the risks which would be involved. The goal of our policy seems to be to regain the power to make over again the same mistakes."

In other words, we are preparing to make over again the mistakes we made almost 25 years ago. What is it that has conditioned our thinking this time so that we are thinking the same mistakes that we thought in 1917?

But if you think these are harsh words regarding the policy which has flowered in the lend-lease law and all its offshoots, I want to call your attention to what Mr. H. G. Wells said in his book, *The Fate of Homo Sapiens*, published in London in 1939.

Speaking of Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt, Wells doubts "if these two fine, active minds have ever inquired how it is they know what they know and think as they do. * * * They have the disposition of all politicians the world over to deal only with made opinion. They have never inquired how it is that opinion is made."

Can it be that what President Roosevelt is handing out is only hand-made opinion that has been handed to him? Can it be that Whitehall speaks to the White House and the White House passes it on to us?

In 1914 American public opinion was not disturbed over the golgs-on in Europe; but in 1917 that public opinion was thirsting for blood. What were the forces that brought about that radical change in attitude?

Only a few years ago our ringing slogan was, "Never again." Today there is a clamor from certain groups for foreign intervention, if not a belief that "war is inevitable." What a rapid change of opinion it has been—planned and put across unknown and unseen. What have been these invisible forces which have wrought such a radical change in our thought and behavior of today from what it was only 3 years ago?

"The universities, bless them, are in uniform or silent," wrote H. G. Wells in 1939. And so they were in 1917. What were the forces that changed their thought and behavior?

Is there any similarity in the forces which have been undermining and redirecting our thinking and behavior recently and almost 25 years ago?

Indeed there is. The parallel is striking and deadly.

That force was and is the hand-out of made opinion—the clever and subtle spread of propaganda. That is the force that has made people think as they think and behave as they behave about participation in this foreign war as it made them think and behave about participation in the former foreign war.

"Oh, there hasn't been any propaganda this time" is a comment heard not infrequently, but that is a result of good propaganda. Propaganda is not recognized as such until it is dead. If it is, it isn't good propaganda. While propaganda is playing upon us, it's information, news. It causes indignation, horror, feelings of moral responsibility, or whatever may be desired. It isn't until after the effect has been produced, until after the event for which it is planned is over, that we usually come to recognize what has caused us to act as we did.

While education is supposed to supply information in its pure form, propaganda surreptitiously selects information, digests it, and serves it up to accomplish its specified purpose, which is to lead to some action which may be going to war or having a new cereal for breakfast.

"Until the war of 1914-18 came to degrade all international standards, it was still considered unfitting and unwise for a statesman to make public pronouncements to his own people which public opinion in other countries would know to be totally untrue," writes Harold Nicolson in his *Diplomacy*. (Thornton Butterworth, 1939.) "The war abolished all such delicacies of conscience. Even the British (who are a truthful race) gradually acquired a taste for propaganda, and proved that they also could tell deliberate lies. . . . By the last years of the war it had become a highly organized system and certainly provided a formidable weapon of popular excitation."

Today the one lie most successfully put forth by the British propagandists has been that there is no British propaganda in America, that there is no need of it, and that it would be useless because the Americans have learned their lesson and are propaganda-proof.

What marvelous propaganda that is.

In his scholarly study *Propaganda for War*, Prof. H. C. Peterson, of the University of Oklahoma, brings out that—

"The British campaign to induce the United States to come to their assistance affected every phase of American life; it was propaganda in its broadest meaning. News, money, and political pressure each played its part, and the battle itself was fought not only in London, New York, and Washington, D. C., but also in American classrooms and pulpits, factories, and offices. It was a campaign to create a pro-British attitude of mind among Americans; to get American sympathies and interests so deeply involved in the European war that it would be impossible for this country to remain neutral."

How well they succeeded in that program you well know. How well they are succeeding today in a repetition of that program, it is not difficult to see. Later, to aid in the enlightenment of those who do not seem to be able to see, I will cite some interesting illustrations of what I mean.

Much thinking about foreign affairs is governed more by emotion than reason. Harness the emotions and humanity can be led like sheep. How this was worked out on the

Americans is brought out by Professor Peterson:

"The first problem confronting the directors of any such campaign was that of winning the sympathy of the general public. When Lord Northcliffe visited this country he remarked of Americans: 'They dress alike, they talk alike, they think alike. What sheep.'"

This estimate of the American people was the basis of the propaganda directed toward us to win us over to active support of the British cause in the last war. And this 1917 Northcliffe formula is not unlike that produced by Capt. Sidney Rogerson, the British officer, who in his book *Propaganda in the Next War*, produced the 1938 formula as seen in these words:

"In the next war, as in the last, the result will probably depend upon the way in which the United States, the great neutral, acts, and her attitude will reflect the reaction of her public to propaganda properly applied. . . . They are more susceptible than most people to mass suggestion—they have been brought up on it."

This British estimate of us should make us bow our heads in shame. We would like to deny it vehemently. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating. They worked on us on the sheep basis in 1916 and 1917—and their idea worked. It worked so well that we worked up such an emotional lather that we could hardly wait to get over into the European slaughterhouse.

Today Captain Rogerson's formula based on our susceptibility to mass suggestion seems to be taking hold. Nothing more than the outbursts of Senators advocating this lend-lease bill and the belligerent foreign policy it represents would seem to indicate that the Rogerson formula was producing the desired results.

But to come back to Professor Peterson. He continues:

"Insofar as Americans were sheep they had to be reached through their emotions. Although every public thinks with its hopes, its fears, and its affections, the pre-war American public was especially sentimental, excessively turbulent in comparison with European, and, finally, was subject to waves of emotion, apathy, interest, and boredom. The work of the British propagandist was to harness these feelings and put them to work for the Allies."

Hilaire Belloc, in his book, *The Cruise of the Nona*, 1925, describes the technique:

"The most comic part of the affair was the attitude toward America. We dared not insult America, for we were naturally as keen on getting American help as is a drowning man on catching a deck chair. In their ignorance, many people came to believe that it was the duty of the Americans to come over and help, and what was more astonishing still, it was represented to them as a matter of life and death, not to us, but to themselves. The Americans were told—heaven knows whether any of them believed it—that if the Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, Turks, and others won in their push against the English, French, and Italians, that after the half-baked won against the baked, the next thing would be a sailing of the conquerors over the sea for the rude domination of Scranton, Pa. Fiddlesticks. But people would really talk like that. They shook their fingers at the United States and said, 'It will be your turn next.'"

How great a task was accomplished from scratch in 1914 was explained by the French historian, Gabriel Hanotaux, in the words he quotes of Robert Bacon, then Ambassador to France and formerly a partner in the House of Morgan, who said, "In the United States there are at present perhaps 50,000 persons who feel that the Nation should immediately intervene in the war on your side. But there are over 100,000,000 Americans who do not so think. Our duty is to reverse these figures so that the 50,000 may become 100,000,000."

The figures were reversed—that is approximately reversed. We went into the war on a wave of idealism, filled with ever-increasing hatred against the barbarian Hun who had committed such frightful atrocities—which it was later proved he didn't commit. We espoused the cause of France and England who were so intent upon putting down militarism, and we believed with Wilson that we were to make the world a better, more democratic place to live in.

That is how well we were conditioned for the fray. That is how well and skillfully our thoughts were directed and our behavior controlled. Our thoughts were merely the prating of official hand-outs; our actions, like those of puppets, controlled by invisible hands manipulating invisible strings.

As Walter Millis brought out in his *Road to War* which he wrote only a few years ago and after which he was dragged back into the nest of those same forces which he had so thoroughly exposed and debunked, "the American view of Europe was normally and unavoidably colored very deeply by the British attitude." On August 5, 1914, the British cut the cables between Germany and the United States, and from that time on all news of foreign affairs was bottlenecked through London.

We learned what London wanted us to learn. We thought and believed what London wanted us to think and believe. But London had fine support. Our American aristocracy—our elite—was distinctly Anglophile—just as it is today; many of them far more interested in the welfare of England than in the welfare of America. Again, as Walter Millis stated in his famous and scholarly book, "those more cultivated elements which dominated our intellectual, political, and financial life still found in London their unacknowledged capital."

Much of our economic aristocracy did most of its foreign business through London. The House of Morgan which for so long waved the financial baton in America was the fiscal agent here for the British Empire. The magazine *Time* for January 20, 1936, quotes a Morgan partner: "Like most of our contemporaries and friends and neighbors, we wanted the Allies to win the war from the outset. We were pro-ally by inheritance, by instinct, by opinion."

And the House of Morgan has apparently not lost any of these inheritances, instincts, opinions, as well as desires and intentions. The *New York Times* for September 5, 1939, reports the arrival of Mr. J. P. Morgan on the *Queen Mary*. "Mr. Morgan was asked to comment on reports that the British Government was considering appointing his firm as official agent here.

"I can't say one word. I know nothing about it," he replied, but after a moment's thought he added, 'It would be a natural thing, if they wanted an American agent, that they would call upon us to repeat our past performances.'"

It would be very interesting to know, wouldn't it, just how far the House of Morgan is today repeating those now famous past performances. We note, not with surprise, however, that Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont is a member of the National Committee of Union Now which would unite this country with Great Britain, and that Thomas W. Lamont, himself a Morgan partner, was the dynamo behind all the belligerent and propaganda activities of the former William Allen White committee to underwrite the security of the British Empire at the cost of the American taxpayer. Past performances are rapidly growing into current performances which, as in the past, tend to war.

To coordinate the various complex agencies for propaganda in the last war Lasswell tells us in his *Propaganda Technique in the World War* that "the British were finally constrained to get up a committee of executives of approximately ministerial importance,

each of whom was charged with some such important branch of propaganda as enemy, home, allied, or neutral. * * * Securing a man of prestige to head each important service."

In his *War Behind the War*, Frank P. Chambers brings out that "the War Propaganda Bureau was created by the Foreign Office in 1914. Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, put Masterman of the Daily News at its head and gave him offices at Wellington House."

Keep that name "Wellington House" carefully in mind because you will hear more about it and the part it played in conditioning the American mind for war in support of Great Britain.

By January 1917 Wellington House had become too small to carry on all the work of the War Propaganda Bureau, and under the dynamic leadership of the new Prime Minister, Lloyd George, there was a sweeping reorganization in the whole British organization for propaganda.

Col. John Buchan, later known as Lord Tweedsmuir who became Governor General of Canada, was placed at the head of the whole department, the four subdivisions of which are described by James Duane Squires in his *British Propaganda Organization*, published by the Harvard University Press in 1935.

These were, according to Squires:

"1. Mr. Masterman's Wellington House, which was now to continue and specialize in its original function of producing and distributing for domestic and neutral consumption books and pamphlets on the war. 2. A cinema department under the direction of Masterman's old lieutenant, Mr. Mair. To this individual's duties was now added also the entertainment of foreign visitors. 3. The Political Intelligence Department, whose primary function was the gathering of evidence on the state of public opinion the world over as it was manifested in the newspaper press. 4. The news department which, as the perhaps sarcastic Mr. Jones described it, was 'the imaginative department, the fiction department, the body which dresses up the facts for presentment to the public, a most important function, and one leaving scope for individual imagination.'"

Wellington House, starting with 9 men in 1917, had 54 and a mailing list of 260,000 names. Sir Gilbert Parker was in charge for the United States, and prepared his *American Press Résumé* for the confidential use of the Cabinet.

In 1918, almost a year after America had gone into the war, Sir Gilbert could afford to be more frank and explicit, and like the criminal going back to the scene of his crime, he had to tell us how he had conditioned us for our costly and disastrous European crusade.

His own story was told in the March 1918 issue of *Harper's Magazine*. The name of the article was "The United States and the War." The author was Sir Gilbert himself. I quote a few paragraphs:

"Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report of the British Cabinet on the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men in England to act for us by interviews in American newspapers; and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George (the present Prime Minister), Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walter Runciman (the Lord Chancellor), Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord

Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphrey Ward, and fully a hundred others.

"Among other things we supplied 360 newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper which gives weekly reviews and comments on the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the Army and Navy, and by letters in reply to individual American critics, which were printed in the chief newspaper of the State in which they lived, and were copied in newspapers of other and neighboring States. We advised and stimulated many people to write articles, we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association by personal correspondence, with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors, and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers.

"It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy, but I was fortunate in having a wide acquaintance in the United States and in knowing that a great many people had read my books and were not prejudiced against me. * * *

"Also, it should be remembered that the Society of Pilgrims, whose work of international unity cannot be overestimated, had played a part in promoting understanding between the two peoples, and the establishment of the American Officers' Club in Lord Leconfield's house in London, with H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught, as president, has done, and is doing, immense good. It should also be remembered that it was the Pilgrims' Society, under the fine chairmanship of Mr. Harry Brittain, which took charge of the Honorable James M. Beck when he visited England in 1916, and gave him so good a chance to do great work for the cause of unity between the two nations. I am glad and proud to think that I had something to do with these arrangements, which resulted in the Pilgrims taking Mr. Beck into their charge."

There are the words of the man who did the job. They don't need verification. But a bit of elaboration does create a bit more enlightenment. Peterson has done that in his most scholarly study, *Propaganda for War*, which has become a recognized authority. In regard to the operation of Wellington House, Peterson says:

"The traditional information agents, ambassadors, and consuls, naturally sent in regular reports. In addition, the Morgan firm kept British officials informed as to conditions in the United States."

Through these various methods and techniques which I have already discussed and in regard to which I have quoted the most authoritative sources, Peterson brings out that the "task of British propagandists was to make an ordinary political-power struggle appear to be a fight between the forces of good and evil."

Just as the British propaganda forces in the last war succeeded in selling us war between the alleged forces of good and evil, so are they using the same technique today. The

air is filled with colorful stories of all the moral issues for which Britain is fighting. It is another holy war. With all her might and main she is fighting against evil and sin. It is a repetition of the 1917 technique, to which I will refer later with some interesting exhibits.

Let me come back to Peterson again:

"The primary objective of a political propaganda campaign is to establish an attitude of mind, a climate of opinion. When such a campaign is successful, the point of view which it has created acts as a censor or interpreter of news and turns those propagandized into propagandists. * * *

"Starting as early as August 1914, prominent men of America hastened to join a cause that was intellectually fashionable."

Didn't it become the fashionable thing to join the William Allen White Committee and the Fight for Freedom Committee of today, as it was fashionable to join the British propaganda groups in the last war? Isn't it becoming the elite and fashionable thing to join the elite in promoting this treasurable Union Now racket? Isn't it among the so-called upper crust that most of the bundling for Britain is being bundled? The same forces are at work today as were at work a quarter of a century ago and toward the same end.

Again quoting Peterson: "Industrialists and financiers one by one took up the cudgels for the belligerents, with whom they were doing so much profitable business. * * * College professors and school teachers repeated with a great show of wisdom the arguments which had originated in Wellington House or in la maison de la presse."

It was this Allied propaganda that won the war. It broke Germany behind the lines. It brought the United States in. The best men, the best brains, were put into the campaign to win our sympathies. There was no limit to what could be spent. There was nothing that was not distorted or lied about or misrepresented to bring us in.

It was Wellington House that brought out the famous Bryce report on German atrocities. That it has been officially refuted from stem to stern is now a matter of official record. This Bryce report on German atrocities has been called by Peterson "one of the worst atrocities of the war."

The propaganda campaign affected every phase of American life, economic, social, political, and spiritual. It was a success. It brought us in on a wave of emotional idealism.

"Emotional appeal was made in every major section of British propaganda," writes Peterson. "A most important phase of this technique was the practice of exploiting idealism. The British did all they could to identify British and American ideals and to picture German actions as attacks upon democracy—the symbol of American idealism. The almost hysterical reaction in the United States to British propaganda demonstrates very clearly the effectiveness of such appeals."

Back of the power of Britain's emotional drive lies an interesting and significant story. In 1832 Britain mastered a new language of potent words. Liberalism, which had made its official advent in England in that year, soon became inextricably linked to the non-conformist conscience and grew into a variety of the Christian religion. Every political, social, and economic issue was translated into moral terms and cloaked in the language of righteousness. It worked wonders—and when a fiction works, the Englishman automatically declares it a fact.

Thus, Britain could shoot civilization into her vast empire and hold that empire together by the force of armies and battle-ships without greatly disturbing the world's moral equanimity.

This technique of taking God into partnership and claiming that the British Empire and the Kingdom of Heaven are synonymous terms is only a bit of holy hocus-pocus for the benefit of a naive and gullible public. And we have learned something of that British technique.

That is why in 1917 President Wilson could preach a holy crusade to save democracy and end war; and why in his 1939 message to Congress President Roosevelt could stir and rouse all our emotions with his charge that "the defense of religion, of democracy, and of good faith is all the same fight. To save one we must now make up our minds to save all."

That is why in 1917 Dr. Lang, then Archbishop of York and later the Archbishop of Canterbury, could come across the Atlantic ocean to expound to us the absurdity that the civilized world was "facing the greatest crisis in its history . . . the time has come when the people of the United States must save the situation."

That is why Chamberlain could refer to a Canadian contingent of troops that had arrived in London, and solemnly speak of "the moral greatness of a cause which has inspired such an intense conviction of its righteousness"; and why Lord Halifax in broadcasting to the Finns, could speak of being "strong in our consciousness of a righteous cause and our faith in a just God."

Propaganda has come to use moral suasion; it changes opinion and belief through the supplying of suitable, selected information and through emotional appeals. All propaganda has a moral connotation fundamentally, and it is intended to exert moral force, appealing to feelings of right and wrong.

One can't get up much enthusiasm for war on a purely intellectual plane. To promote a war you must whoop up the moral purpose. It was piled into us in 1917. We have been drugged on it today.

You have to get folks filled with idealism. The enemy must be made the blackest kind of a villain so the folks back home won't think too much about the failures of diplomats and others directing foreign policies. To feel a proper moral responsibility to put down evil by the use of the bayonet and high explosives, one must be deeply stirred emotionally.

All right. Let's turn again to the record of then and now.

In 1915, Norman Angell was writing about the importance of the British Navy and British naval policy, supported by American action, in relation to that emotional theme of the future of civilization. England must have a free hand to do as she pleased on the high seas, because upon the action of the British Navy will depend the kind of lives that we shall live in the future.

That was 25 years ago; and today the same high ideal is reechoed as something new, as something that makes the issue today not only highly moral but far more noble and moral than was the issue then.

Along comes Dorothy Thompson, who has attained high position in that crowd determined to fight for international purity, and she naively announced in her column for October 13, 1939, that the French polli and the simplest Englishman know "that this is not a war to maintain the status quo of Versailles or British imperialism."

Oh, no, indeed; it is not a war for any such material and rational thing as that. If it was, she says, "they would not fight it." Maybe that has something to do with why the French did quit. But Dorothy goes on—and note well what she said and how it dovetails into the words of Norman Angell 25 years ago. Concluded Dorothy: "He knows that this is the great European civil war, the object of which is to determine what sort of Europe he is going to live in."

On September 25, 1914, Mr. Asquith held up the banner of a high and emotion-stirring ideal, when, speaking in Dublin, he referred to "the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambitions, for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise, of a real European partnership, based on the recognition of equal rights and established and enforced by the common will."

But 25 years later—in November 1939—Mr. Chamberlain expressed his opinions about what had to be done about other people's force when he said that it was necessary to beat "that aggressive, bullying mentality which seems continually to dominate other peoples by force."

World War No. 1 was a holy war. The religious leaders of the country told us so. "It is neither a travesty nor exaggeration to call this war on the part of America a truly holy war," said Henry Churchill King, then president of Oberlin College—so truly a holy war that Randolph H. McKim proclaimed from his Washington pulpit: "It is God who has summoned us to this war. It is His war we are fighting. . . . This conflict is indeed a crusade. The greatest in history—the holiest. It is in the profoundest and truest sense a holy war . . . Yes, it is Christ, the King of Righteousness, who calls us to grapple in deadly strife with this unholy and blasphemous power."

Terrible words? Indeed they are, and particularly so in the light of present-day knowledge of what that war was really about and what was accomplished as a result of it. But when the emotional boiler is fired, that is the height to which the steam pressure gage rises.

Let us remember that—let us not forget it—when we hear President Roosevelt tell us that we must be prepared to fight for religion; or when President Conant, of Harvard, tells, as he did in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, that "this present war has in it many of the characteristics of a religious war." Let us not forget it today when there is placed in our hands that little folder entitled "The American Churches and the International Situation" and signed by a large group of some of the most distinguished ministers in America, saying that they "believe that when Christians are convinced that their nation is engaged in resistance to aggression or in defense of international order they must obey its call. Throughout Christian history the latter has been the view of the majority of the churches. We believe it is so today."

Nothing in the propaganda of today about the righteous and moral issues at stake is one whit different from the emotional outburst of 25 years ago when these anonymous words appeared in *The Nation* (London) in March 1915:

"America, be the correctness of her attitude what it may, cannot be morally impartial; two rival ideas struggle for the mastery of civilization. Which does America choose? Military force or civilized law?"

Are there any more familiar-sounding words dinned into our ears today than those words written 25 years ago? Just war propaganda—then and now; the emotionalized moral issues that are deliberately created to drive men and women to war.

The epic of them all, however, is found in the words of Lord Curzon spoken in the House of Lords on April 19, 1918, which by some strange and grim coincidence, comparable to the number assigned to this lend-lease bill, was the anniversary of the Battles of Lexington and Concord:

"The entry of the United States into the war stamps the character of the struggle as an uprising of the conscience of the world in a combined effort to put an end to the rule of Satan on this earth."

Wherever he was and whoever he is, Satan must have had a hearty laugh; and he prob-

ably chuckled audibly on January 21, 1940, when he read the modern version of this same old myth in the ecstatic words of J. L. Garvin in the *London Observer*:

"This war in the moral sense is the greatest of wars. The allied cause is true and glorious in the Miltonic sense. It is a war for European freedom and for the rights of man in all the world."

Overcome by the war fever induced by propaganda from Wellington House, the great eastern universities were in the forefront in putting us into the last war. They waved high the banner of an emotional, idealistic crusade, just as they are doing today.

Sir Gilbert Parker recognized the importance, susceptibility and ease of getting the university people. In his memoirs he wrote, "We established association by personal correspondence with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with the university and college presidents, professors, and scientific men, and running through all ranges of population."

By February 1916, Peterson tells us, "Parker was able to report that the articulate people throughout the United States had joined the Allies. The success of the British propagandists corroborates the statement that there are no limits to the field of propaganda. The only restrictions are on the manner of approach. . . . Educators can be controlled simply through controlling their reading matter. . . . In contradistinction to the easy surrender of American leaders to war hysteria was the stubborn pacifism of the great mass of the people," as today.

Why college professors are more susceptible to these hate psychoses than are the uncultured masses, is perhaps explained by Einstein in a letter to Freud (quoted by Hogben in his *Dangerous Thoughts*): "Experience proves that it is the so-called intelligentsia that is most apt to yield to these disastrous collective suggestions, since the intellectual has no direct contact with life in the raw but encounters it in its easiest synthetic form, the printed page."

And Wellington House saw to it that there were plenty of the right kind of printed pages placed in the hands of the intellectuals, and thus convince them of the validity of the thought which Walter Millis has put into a phrase which has become classic: "One of the greatest of the qualities which have made the English a great people is their eminently sane, reasonable, fair-minded inability to conceive that any viewpoint save their own can possibly have the slightest merit."

Then the great advantage in pushing propaganda in the universities is that once the university and college people have accepted the propaganda they promulgate it with an air of authority not only to their students but as lecturers in clubs and forums, in radio addresses and public statements, and even at congressional hearings. The stamp of the university gives authority.

So it was that a university president, quoted by E. W. Knight in his *What College Presidents Say*, could say in his commencement address in 1918: "The chief end of men who would glorify God is to kill Germans and no explanatory footnotes required."

In 1915 the Harvard student body was being injected with the defense and preparedness serum. In March of 1915 President Lowell and Gen. Leonard Wood had appeared together to speak in favor of military training camps. President Emeritus Eliot in his Memorial Day address stirred the militarily inclined by saying that "The soldier who goes to war for the love and defense of his country is not brutalized by fierce fighting."

And today we are witnessing a repetition of that same story. University loud speakers began sounding off early in the fall of 1939. Yale's President Seymour felt an unctuous concern for the "principles of international

morality," and President Conant, of Harvard, expressed fear that "the hope of free institutions as a basis of modern civilization will be jeopardized" if his students should "handicap those who are fighting for ideals we share," and he resents the thought that it should "be taken as a premise that the only matter before the country is how to keep the United States out of war."

Conant is the commander in chief today of the battalion of university presidents and professors who, as members of the former William Allen White Committee and other groups that have been so successfully whooping up the good and holy war. As the great intellectual leader of a holy cause to shoot righteousness into all the world which should be so reformed, President Conant appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the lend-lease bill and proclaimed the proposition that "our only hope as a free people lies in a defeat of the Axis Powers," and that if our going to war was necessary to achieve that end, he was for war. Then Conant was sent to England on a scientific mission allegedly connected with our defense program.

But Conant's student body, the boys who would have to do the fighting and dying in the war that President Conant would declare, are not in unanimous accord. The Harvard Crimson charged that he and others were "earning an unenviable place in the road gang that is trying to build for the United States a superhighway straight to Armageddon," and added that "the lofty positions of these men give their words weight beyond their worth."

In 1939 Oxford University Press published the book *World Order*, by Lionel Curtis, the religio-intellectual dreamer of the group known as Lord Milner's Kindergarten, inspired and trained in Cecil Rhodes' New Imperialism. Lowell, of Harvard, wrote the introduction in which he praises Curtis as seeing the need for increased "intensity of the conviction that right is right and wrong is wrong, and that it is the duty of men to place service to mankind above all selfish considerations."

Such feelings and attitude actuated the men of the Spanish Inquisition and Puritan New England and persist in those who have had the ecclesiastical imperialistic training of the British. There can never be any doubt in their minds as to who is "right" and what their "duty" may be. Fears for the safety of the Empire turn them to religion. There is much about "the infinite duty of men to God," which is entwined in his mind with what Kipling called the "white man's burden."

The effort at present of British propagandists is to make Americans believe, just as they succeeded in doing in the last war, that we have a "moral stake" in this war. We are to fight for the British Raj—that is, the "religion" of Lionel Curtis, the "morality" of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the "civilization" of Chamberlain.

In the last war Britain made an emotional appeal to us to support "democracy" and defeat "militarism." If she were making an appeal today, if there were British propaganda instead of mere explanation, which is, of course, denied, the aim would be to stimulate our feeling of "moral responsibility" to "put down evil"—all of which means—to help Britain lick hell out of Germany.

But there are many more than idealistic emotions which are stirred by the propaganda which swept over the country 25 years ago and is sweeping over the country today.

There is the emotion of fear. Scare us to death over the threat of invasion. That is wonderfully effective propaganda technique and has been used with all the persistence and resources at the command of Whitehall and the White House.

Both Wellington House and the House of Morgan recognized the value and importance of this propaganda of fear—fear of what it

was alleged would happen to us if England should lose and Germany win. As Peterson points out: "Aided by the realities of submarine warfare, the contention was made that the United States was actually menaced by Germany. The success of this argument is demonstrated in the statement of Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman, who remarked, 'I do not think we embarked in the war in a humanitarian crusade. It was for self-defense.' The 'our fight' idea culminated in the assertion that the Monroe Doctrine would be violated if the Germans were victorious."

And nowhere was this propaganda of fear of conquest better expressed than in the words of J. P. Morgan at the hearings on the munitions investigation: "The whole German nation had started out on the war with the cry of world domination or annihilation."

In 1916 the book *The Invasion of America*, by Julius W. Muller, portraying a fearful invasion of America, was given wide distribution. Last year the people of the country were harrowed by a similar book by Hendrik Willem Van Loon, picturing battles with Nazis all over Vermont and Connecticut.

In the spring of 1915 Hudson Maxim, inventor and manufacturer of machine guns, presented to the members of the senior class at Harvard copies of his book just published under the title "Defenseless America," the opening paragraph of which is the key to the big build-up for war:

"The main object of this book is to present a phalanx of facts upon the subject of the defenseless condition of this country and to show what must be done, and done quickly, in order to divert the more dire calamity that can fall upon a people—that of merciless invasion of a foreign foe, with the horrors of which no pestilence can be compared."

It was just a part of the big build-up for the war to come, and not one whit different in principle from the current fear of threat of invasion that has been built up through different techniques, not the least important of which has been the words of the President—foreign submarines off our coast when driving through changes in our Neutrality Act—bombers of an invading enemy flying over our Midwest States—and his fireside chat about the "gun at our head."

Scare hell out of us, that's the technique that helps build up the war fever—unless those who hear the terrifying words are able and do see through their sham, pretense, and complete humbuggery.

Back in 1938 Capt. Sidney Rogerson explained how this technique would be used—how this type of steam would be put on us. He told us in his book, *Propaganda in the Next War*, just how they were going to make our mental processes operate. He had prepared then the blueprints of our thoughts of today.

While he was telling us that their propaganda would be based on the general theme of democracy and freedom versus dictatorship and persecution, he was adding the thought that there must be pictured some direct threat to America and believed that Japan might be built up to serve as that hobgoblin.

Note these following words from Captain Rogerson, and note the evidence all around you of their fulfillment:

"Though we are not unfavorably placed, we shall require to do much propaganda to keep the United States benevolently neutral. To persuade her to take our part will be much more difficult. . . . It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen, before the Republic will again take arms in an external quarrel. The position will naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved, and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the

Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany."

There, in those words, you have a prediction that has come true, and a confession that reveals truth. It is simply unbelievable how anyone can fail to see the truth in those words, and the utter deception in the words used to create public fear and arouse our emotions to the point where we will again take up arms to engage in another crazy war of foreign power politics.

But Rogerson, at this point, adds a few more significant words: " . . . our main plank will be the old democratic one. We must clearly enunciate our belief in the democratic form of government, and our firm resolve to adhere to it."

Under the pounding, the constant pounding, the repetitive pounding of emotional catch-phrases and words and fears, the people of this country are being pounded into a foreign war under a dictatorship authorized by this off-to-war lend-lease bill, and all for the glory and security of the British Empire with a little bit of Greece and a piece of China thrown in just for the present emergency.

Another phase of the Wellington House propaganda 25 years ago was the propaganda of economics. As Peterson says: "Where propagandists tried to establish the identity of British and American idealism, agents directing the economic maneuvers attempted to fuse the industrial and financial systems of the two countries. . . . The conscription of American industry and commerce by the British was made possible by the elimination of business connections between the United States and Germany."

These factors, together with the British loans, "gave Americans a vested interest in the Allies' cause," and added to this they created "good will between the United States and Great Britain and, indirectly, ill will between the United States and Germany. Each step was propaganda in the most practical meaning of the word," according to Peterson, who quotes the following from a Wellington House report of early 1916:

"American banking is so intimately connected with the American Stock Exchange that the opinions of the latter may fairly be said to represent those of the whole financial community. From the beginning of the present war, prices in Wall Street have risen regularly in response to any military successes of the Allies, and fallen with equal regularity when the Central Powers achieved successes."

The long range aftereffect of the propaganda that led to the authorization of vast British loans was not so good. Many were the embarrassing moments when we intimated that even no more than a token payment would be appreciated. You know, those loans never were repaid, and that consequently, because of the Johnson Act, we could make no further loans legally.

Well, why bother about loans, say our British friends. And the wheels of propaganda of these latter days began to whirl toward the end of giving everything to a nation that no longer can afford to buy. Britain's interest in the passage of the lend-lease bill came out in the open with the arrival of Lord Halifax and his appearance at the Capitol in the interest of the lend-lease bill timetable. The pressure behind this bill changed from propaganda in subtle form to open advocacy in the raw, but it parallels with slight variations the economic and financial propaganda of the first World War days.

The parallel between what happened just prior to 1917 and what has been happening in this country during the past year and a half is deadly. Just as in 1917, the leadership of this country has been driving toward war. Our people have not been consulted. They were not consulted then. Our people

have been propagandized and deceived. They were propagandized and deceived then.

In November 1916 a President of the United States was reelected on the slogan "He kept us out of war."

In November 1940 a President of the United States was reelected on what seemed to be the proposition that he would keep us out of war.

In January 1917 a personal representative of the reelected President went to confer with the rulers of the British Empire.

In January 1941 a personal representative of the reelected President went to confer with the rulers of the British Empire, and in August 1941 the American President and the British Prime Minister entered into an eight-point alliance.

In 1914 Woodrow Wilson pleaded for complete neutrality.

In 1939, at the outbreak of war abroad, President Roosevelt asked for complete neutrality in acts, if not in thought.

"The first 21 months of neutrality," at the time of the first World War, says Peterson, "reveal very clearly how the Wilson administration quite unconsciously adopted the British point of view of the war as its own point of view."

The first 19 months of our neutrality in the present war reveal equally clearly a conscious adoption of the British point of view; a quick change from neutrality to what is conveniently called "nonbelligerency"; the break-down of our neutrality law; our first peacetime conscription; the rearming of the British Army after the disaster of Dunkirk; the turning over to Britain of 50 of our destroyers, passage of the lend-lease law; the occupation of Iceland; convoys; and the "shoot on sight" order. We have moved much faster and farther in these 19 months than we did in the 21-month period of a quarter of a century ago; we are being moved by the same forces and toward the same end.

In 1916 among the many pro-Ally propaganda organizations there stands out prominently the Navy League. Among its prominent sponsors stood Thomas W. Lamont and Frederic R. Coudert.

In 1940 appeared the now famous William Allen White Committee. Among its prominent sponsors stood Thomas W. Lamont and a member of the Coudert family. Later appeared the more candid warmongering Fight for Freedom Committee.

In January 1917 the President, in asking the Congress for unusual powers, said: "I am not proposing or contemplating war or any steps that may lead to it. I merely request that you will accord me the authority to safeguard in practice the rights of a great people who are at peace."

But 3 months later, April 1917, that same President took his people into war.

In January 1941 the President, in asking the Congress for unusual power, said: "To change a whole nation from a basis of peacetime production of implements of peace to a basis of wartime production of implements of war is no small task."

In April 1941—where will we be then?

The statement that there was no propaganda to take us into the war on the side of Britain in 1917 is only the tinkle of brass and cymbals. It is now a matter of official record, including all the documentary evidence of the activities of Wellington House that there were powerful and subtle and secret forces at work to change our neutral thoughts and behavior to flaming thoughts and belligerent behavior.

As Squires puts it so well: "For nothing is capable of being more firmly established than the twin facts that British propaganda existed in the United States from the end of 1914 onward, and that this propaganda was official in the sense that it was paid for by the British Government, supervised by the agents of the British Government, and

handled by the propaganda department of the British Government, Wellington House."

And vast sums of money were spent on this propaganda to steam up our emotions. Squires says: "From the figures already quoted from parliamentary committees of investigation, the present writer would estimate that British propaganda, including all items which were budgeted under that head, in the last 2 years of the war alone cost close to £2,000,000."

And then, to keep our emotions fully fired and steamed up for the duration, George Creel, who has just joined Fight for Freedom, stated in his *How We Advertised America* that the total costs for propaganda in the United States during the entire period of American participation in the war were slightly less than \$5,000,000. "This American 'Wellington House,'" says Peterson, "had as its objective the transmuting of the sympathy for the Allies—the product of 2½ years of effort on the part of European propagandists—into an active or even violent force."

In other words, \$5,000,000 was taken from the American people to spend on propaganda to keep them convinced of their privilege of spending and giving away untold and uncounted billions of dollars and dying by the tens of thousands in a holy crusade to underwrite the power politics of Great Britain.

By 1918, says Peterson, "Americans were responding cordially to the propaganda appeals. By that time they were enjoying the war thoroughly and hating the Germans in a very satisfactory manner."

Both of these eminent authorities, Squires and Peterson, are agreed on the importance, effectiveness, and success of the British propaganda. As Squires puts it: "Resolve the problem in any way that one will, turn it about and consider it from as many angles as he may please, one must ever come back to one cardinal point: British propaganda was a real force in winning the World War. It kept the home masses docilely patriotic. It gained, or mightily helped to gain, powerful allies."

And Peterson adds to that what he calls the volunteer propagandists—native Americans. "These were individually enlisted in some cases, but in the main were regimented into 'soldiers of the king' by a process of eliminating, or at least curtailing, enemy interpretations of the war and by dominating the news with exaggerated and warped pro-Ally accounts of what was happening or had happened. Once these natives had acquired the 'correct' frame of mind, they were enlisted for the duration of the war, the formal propaganda groups acting merely as connecting and reinforcing elements of the British propaganda organizations. The real propagandists were Americans—our preachers, teachers, politicians, and journalists."

And history is repeating itself again. I have already related many of the outstanding facts of the deadly parallel between what happened once before and what has been happening again right under our eyes.

Many of our preachers, teachers, professors, politicians, and journalists are blazing the same trail which the similar groups blazed 25 years ago. I have put the evidence before you. Who has conditioned them? What forces have influenced their thinking and directed their behavior?

We can only become conscious of a force by observing the results, and this is particularly true of moral force. We recognize that a man has "got religion" from his changed behavior. We recognize that a man has "got propaganda" from his aroused emotions, when suddenly he has gone all-out for international morality, religion, and moral responsibility for civilization.

That is what has happened, regardless of all violent denials to the contrary notwithstanding. With the President leading the way, with university presidents following their finance-minded trustees, all the little

professors must vie with each other, as well as others in the elite political, journalistic, and intellectual classes, to show interest in the preservation of "morality" and "religion," by the British imperialistic method.

The inculcation of these beliefs was made easy by the long educational work and Anglophile sympathies of what has been called the British network by that keen observer, Quincy Howe, in his fine book, *England Expects Every American To Do His Duty*:

"I am concerned solely with the influence of the rulers of Britain—hereafter referred to for the sake of brevity as England or Britain—upon certain influential Americans, and, through these individuals, upon the American public. Finally, I have written this book in the belief that this influence will play a larger part than any other single factor on the destinies of both the English and the American peoples in the course of the next 10 years."

"In 1917 the United States entered the World War, which not only rescued but extended the British Empire. Today the problem of the British Foreign Office is to repeat the trick and save the Empire from an even graver crisis. Since 1920 the wheels that will involve the United States in another war to save the British Empire have moved ceaselessly and at accelerating speed. How urgent is Britain's need? America's peace depends on the answer."

"THE BRITISH NETWORK"

"It's fun, of course, to be fooled by the British for a century and more, but it's more fun to know how the trick works. The previous chapter simply reviewed the record; this one will try to show how the record took the form it did. And an extraordinary spectacle unfolds. We shall see almost the entire ruling caste in the United States obeying British orders with an eager servility that arises from the unique character of modern American society. We shall see that the relationship between America and England has no parallel in the modern world."

"AMERICA APES BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE"

"In short, a nation's foreign policy is usually determined by its natural resources, its social order, its population density, its technical equipment, and its geographic position. But the United States, alone among the great powers, bases its foreign policy on an entirely different and quite intangible factor. Ancestral ties of language, tradition, and blood exercise such an attraction upon the American ruling class that it adapts its own selfish interests—not to mention the interests of the country as a whole—to the needs and desires of the British Foreign Office."

"ENGLAND'S HOUR OF NEED"

"The history of Anglo-American relations might seem, on the surface, to suggest that British statesmen had bludgeoned or bamboozled American statesmen into taking orders from Downing Street. But the power that Britain wields in the United States does not arise from intellectual or economic superiority. If England, in its hour of need, expects every American to do his duty, that expectation does not arise from the usual economic consideration. On the contrary. If material factors alone determined American national policy, the United States would either have taken over the British Empire after the war or retired into its shell. Instead, it has puttered about the four corners of the earth only to emerge at every critical juncture defending British interests more heartily than the British themselves."

"SPEAK SAME LANGUAGE"

"To account for this curious state of affairs it is necessary to recall certain facts that many Americans accept as instinctively as they do the color of the sky. First, and most important, Englishmen and Americans speak the same language. They read the same books, magazine articles, and news

dispatches; they hear the same lectures and radio broadcasts; they attend the same plays and talking pictures. Furthermore, this common language originated in England, whence the first settlers of the Thirteen Colonies came. In consequence many Americans look instinctively to England as the court of last appeal in all questions involving tradition, scholarship, morals, law, and manners.

"This tendency to hold England in reverence appears most flagrantly in the American governing classes. They prefer to commune with their Maker in the exclusive atmosphere of the Episcopal Church, which grew from England's official national church. The private boarding schools which the sons of the American aristocracy attend are modeled on Eton, Harrow, and Winchester. The cult of the gentleman and the gospel of fair play originated in England and have been taken up more enthusiastically in the United States than in any other country. The great American unwashed may attend professional baseball games, just as the great unwashed of England attend professional football matches; the Anglo-American aristocracy prefers polo, yacht races, and fox hunts.

"VISITING AMERICANS GET 'WORKS'"

"The weakness of well-dressed Americans for the British way of life has given rise to an elaborate ritual, vulgarly known as the 'works', to which visiting Americans are subjected in London. Seedy yearning journalists from Corn Belt find themselves seated in the distinguished visitors' section of the House of Commons. Business and professional men will be asked to teas and garden parties by the new rich of old England. Utility magnates, Senators, railroad, bank, and college presidents rate dinner and week-end invitations from members of the nobility."

"ENGLAND EXPORTS CULTURE"

"To judge from the cultural interests of most well-to-do Americans, they share this Old World regret for the incident of 1783. They flock in droves to hear Lord Lytton, Sir Arthur Salter, and Sir Arthur Willert interpret world affairs from the point of view of the British Foreign Office. They lap up the novels of Sir Hugh Walpole, Charles Morgan, and Warwick Deeping, from whom they gain an insight into the finer shades of civilized life as only English ladies and gentlemen can live it. And even if they never plan a pilgrimage to such Anglo-Saxon shrines as Westminster Abbey, Shakespeare's birthplace, or the Albert Memorial, they become unofficial members of the great British family of nations by joining the English Speaking Union.

"SPEARHEAD OF HER DRIVE"

"For all its innocent appearance, this organization is nothing more nor less than the spearhead of England's cultural drive on the United States. The purpose of the English Speaking Union, according to its own prospectus, is 'First, to draw together in the bond of comradeship the English-speaking people of the world; second, to strengthen the friendly relationship between the people of the United States and of the British Empire by (a) disseminating knowledge of each to the other, and (b) inspiring reverence for their common institutions.' The activities of the English Speaking Union include hospitality to overseas travelers, forums for discussion, interchange of secondary school teachers, scholarships, special luncheons and dinners, cooperation with other organizations in entertaining visitors, intelligent travel service, friendly personal contacts, and interchange of gifts and messages between cities and towns in Great Britain and their namesakes in the New World.

"The facilities of the English Speaking Union include its headquarters in London and smaller branches in many other cities in the British Isles, the dominions, and the United States. British subjects and citizens of the British dominions may join the Eng-

lish Speaking Union of the British Empire for a guinea a year. Citizens of the United States may join the English Speaking Union of the United States, a parallel and self-governing organization, for \$5 a year. All members receive the same monthly bulletin, the *Landmark*, published, as luck will have it, in London, and all have access to any of the union's quarters.

"DIRECTORS FROM UPPER CRUST"

"The English Speaking Union was born in the historic year of 1917, and since then has not only helped thousands of travelers but has encouraged social contacts between all English-speaking peoples. Yet its directors are better known as financiers, statesmen, churchmen, journalists, educators, lawyers, and industrialists than as lecture managers, tourist agents, or professional entertainers.

"Far from regarding membership in the English Speaking Union as a form of hyphenated Americanism, these influential citizens believe that to give aid and comfort to the British Empire is to serve the highest aims of the United States, and even of humanity as a whole. Most of them, in fact, would be profoundly shocked to find themselves listed as anything short of 100-percent Americans, and they will frequently take issue with certain aspects of British policy and British civilization. They simply lend themselves to the cause of their favorite charity, their favorite political party, or their chosen religion.

"IDEAL FOR BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE"

"Furthermore, if the British Foreign Office were to prepare its own ideal roster of those Americans who could do most to promote British interests in the United States, it could scarcely improve on the actual list of men and women who control the English Speaking Union. This does not mean that the English Speaking Union is the creature and creation of the British Foreign Office, or that its directors consciously and deliberately serve British interests at the expense of American interests. On the contrary, they regard themselves as the noblest Americans of them all. But whether it actually serves the best interests of the American people to give aid and comfort to the British Empire is another story.

"That story unfolds as we pursue the interests and activities of English Speaking Union leaders in various directions. To begin with, they all tend to favor internationalism in general and the League of Nations in particular.

"If the League of Nations Association interlocks with the English Speaking Union in respect to personnel, objectives, and general character, the Foreign Policy Association bears a similar relationship to the League of Nations Association. Just as the League of Nations Association does not announce Anglo-American cooperation as its primary aim, so the Foreign Policy Association does not assert that its objective is to get the United States into the League of Nations. Yet that is the open ambition of many of its leading spirits.

"Not all these people have publicly advocated Anglo-American collaboration. Some of them have not even declared themselves in favor of the League of Nations. They do, however, stand for two things. They all belong to or speak for the conservative propertied classes and they all favor a more positive cooperative foreign policy. Which is exactly the same thing as saying that they belong to the British network. For, in respect to foreign policy, the propertied classes in the United States have no alternative to offer.

"Still another organization devoted to American foreign policy illustrates still more clearly the pro-British bias of most well-to-do Americans. The Council on Foreign Relations, organized shortly after the war, calls itself a nonpartisan and noncommercial organization studying the international aspects of America's political, economic, and financial problems. It is not a trade organization and

has no connection with any political party. Its membership is composed of men of many professions, with a variety of interests and views. Membership in the council is elective and the 500 rank-and-file members include a real cross section of political and economic opinion. Even the quarterly organ of the council, *Foreign Affairs*, prints as varied an assortment of articles as any magazine in the field.

"But on the board of 18 directors we encounter many of our friends of the English Speaking Union.

"So far our survey of the British network has been confined to international sport, to the synthetic hospitality of an English Speaking Union dinner, and to the grinding boredom produced by the meeting of the minds of Walter Lippmann, Newton D. Baker, and Norman Davis in the innermost sanctum of the Council on Foreign Relations. Let us now watch these gentlemen at their daily duties. For to discover the members of the British network doing their masters' business, we must see them doing their own.

ROLE OF MORGAN BANK

"At the risk of hammering one point beyond recognition, mention must again be made of the importance of the Morgan Bank as Britain's financial base of operations in the United States. Its role in the World War as sole purchasing agent for the British Government leaves no doubt as to its importance during that period, and the statements of Messrs. Morgan and Lamont at the time of the Nye investigation do credit to their forthright support of the British position.

"To Mr. Morgan there was never any question of following the lead of his President and remaining neutral in mind and thought. The moment the Germans threatened the security of England by invading Belgium, 'We found it impossible to be neutral.' And if we are to believe Thomas W. Lamont, Mr. Morgan's partner and spokesman, most of the best people who lived along the eastern seaboard felt the same way. 'Does anyone,' asked Mr. Lamont in a letter to the *New York Times*, dated October 18, 1935, 'even of the post-war generation, believe that business interest determined the pro-Ally sentiments of Morrow or Morgan or Davison, or any of us? Surely not. Like most of our contemporaries and friends and neighbors, we wanted the Allies to win from the start. We were pro-Ally by inheritance, by instinct, by opinion, and so were almost all the people we knew on the eastern seaboard of the United States from the moment Germany violated Belgium's neutrality.'

"NEW YORK TIMES PRO-BRITISH"

"Mr. Lamont's priceless definition of the American aristocracy—'almost all the people we knew on the eastern seaboard'—holds just as good today as it did in 1917. It also covers like a tent the chief figures in the British network, notably the owners and editors of the *New York Times*, which is Britain's chief propaganda organ in the United States, just as Morgan's is Britain's chief financial base.

"UNITED STATES UNDERWRITES BRITAIN FOR NOTHING"

"The British Foreign Office understands clearly enough that an alliance with the United States is not practical politics today. In fact, the British Foreign Office decidedly prefers the present state of affairs whereby the United States unofficially underwrites the British Empire and gets nothing in exchange. It is only the American members of the British network who advocate some more formal arrangement involving a quid pro quo. Even J. P. Morgan does not like to give something for nothing."

But these older cogs in the British network are much less effective for the purposes of the Anglophiles than a newer organization, Union Now. The welfare of our country

demands that we take a little time to examine the activities and composition of that curious organization.

UNION NOW

"From the way in which accounts between Britain and America are now getting somewhat mixed, the step forward to a common army, navy, and air force—and taxation to pay for them—is not far distant. . . . We in Great Britain have all to gain from a union, and the invitation must come from America." (Col. Josiah Wedgewood, member of the British Parliament, in the course of an American lecture tour, Washington Times-Herald, July 9, 1941.)

As others see us

The American people have expressed their desire to aid Britain by "steps short of war." Attempts are now under way to undermine that policy and to drag the United States into the present war by the devious method of urging alliance with Britain. Symptomatic of these attempts have been the recent statements of British leaders. As public officials, of one country, they could not, of course, openly and expressly urge another country to declare war or to form an immediate alliance which necessarily involved participation in war. But their public statements have gone as far as was possible. Thus, Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, urged recently an Anglo-American alliance after the war for the purpose of establishing a new world order, to which other nations (including the Latin American countries) would be permitted to adhere. (Christian Science Monitor, June 20, 1941.) Prime Minister Winston Churchill has called for Anglo-American unity of aims, and has proclaimed that "united we can save and guide the world." (Washington Post, June 17, 1941.) Austrian Minister Richard G. Casey announced in one address that neither the United States nor the British Commonwealth could alone solve post-war problems, and asked for recognition of the "fact" that "we are essential to each other in peace—as essential to each other as one blade of a pair of scissors is to the other." (New York Times, June 14, 1941.) In another address, which the press reported as stopping "just short of advocating immediate union of English-speaking peoples . . ." he proclaimed that preservation of the world was in the combined hands of the United States and the British family of nations. (Baltimore Sun, July 5, 1941.) Dr. R. C. Wallace, principal of Queen's University, in Canada, looked forward to a permanent partnership of the United States and Canada as an outcome of the war, for the ultimate purpose of cementing a permanent Anglo-American alliance. (New York Times, June 24, 1941.) The most forthright of British propagandists to visit the United States, Col. Josiah Wedgewood, called for immediate union and American participation in the war, in such tactless terms (New York Times, June 3, 1941; Washington Times-Herald, July 9, 1941) that his visit here was soon terminated by the embarrassed British Government.

Lead kindly Streit

The most important organizational expression of the elements which desire an Anglo-American alliance is Federal Union, Inc., organized in 1939 to promote the plan conceived by Clarence K. Streit, and commonly known as Union Now. According to the annual report of Dr. Emery W. Baldur, executive director of Federal Union, Inc., this organization now has 93 chapters in as many American cities, and 126 separate organizing groups. During the past year and a half they have produced and distributed more than 1,500,000 pieces of literature. (Federal Union World, July-August 1941.)

In addition to numerous sporadic broadcasts (including the American Forum of the Air on Sunday, August 3, 1941) Federal Union

has recorded a series of some 15 radio talks to be rebroadcast over local stations throughout the country. Extensive publicity in contemporary periodicals presents the message of immediate union with Britain to an audience of several million people. During the month of July this propaganda was featured in Readers' Digest, Liberty, and Look. The September issue of Screen Life is presenting a story on the Federal Union plan as explained by those heroes and heroines of Hollywood, suddenly turned foreign affairs experts, who are Union Now devotees. The Book of the Month Club has announced that as their book dividend for September and October they will give away copies of both Clarence Streit's original Union Now and his more recent Union Now with Britain, to from 150,000 to 200,000 of their members. The executive director of Federal Union, Inc., boasts further that from March to May of this year his committee obtained 31,686 inches of free newspaper publicity. (E. W. Baldur, Federal Union Convention Report, Cleveland, June 29, 1941.)

27 to 23

The advantages to an embattled Britain of such a union are obvious. The advantages to the United States are less evident, and supporters of Union Now find it necessary to speak in generalities and platitudes in order to sell their plan on this side of the Atlantic. One new feature of Clarence Streit's plan, as revised in his second book, Union Now with Great Britain, is designed to appeal to those Americans who cherish visions of imperialistic grandeur à la Henry Luce. For example, in his column of March 22, 1941 (New York Herald Tribune, March 23), Mark Sullivan wrote:

"While Britain is unable, alone, and the United States is unwilling, the two together could readily dominate the world. Britain could continue to be greatest mercantile seagoing nation. As to naval power, Britain and the United States in union could have dominance beyond any dream of challenge."

Sugarcoating

Glossing over their immediate demand to abrogate the sovereign independence of the United States, Mr. Streit and his fellow unionists hasten to assure us of their desire that such a nuclear union between Britain and the United States "shall grow gradually into the United States of Man by peaceful admission of outside peoples to equal membership" as soon as such peoples shall have established their fidelity to the democratic way of life. (Look, July 29, 1941, p. 38.) By thus envisioning as a possible outgrowth of their plan some beatific system of worldwide cooperation for the betterment of man, the Federal Unionists have corralled into their camp many sincere persons who realize that world peace can only result from universal recognition of the brotherhood of mankind, and who hopefully grasp at Union Now as a tangible movement with such an end as a possibility, however remote. These followers are inclined to overlook the imperialist structure of the British Empire, as, indeed, they also overlook the British background of the leading American proponents of Union Now.

British network

But a more important fact which is overlooked is that Union Now is geared to American participation in the war and to Anglo-American world domination—its inevitable, if not its ostensible, result. This is not surprising, when the leading supporters of Union Now are identified. The Federal Union organization must be viewed against the long history of attempts in the United States to promote American participation in the League of Nations and to bring about an Anglo-American alliance. Space is lacking to review here what one informed commentator called the British network (Quincy Howe,

England Expects Every American To Do His Duty (1937)), but it is clear the Federal Union reflects the influence of such organizations as the League of Nations Association, the English Speaking Union, the Foreign Policy Association, and the Council on Foreign Relations.

Who's who

Leading interventionists abound in the ranks of Federal Union. Many of the leading supporters of Union Now are members or active supporters of such interventionist groups as the Committee to Defend America (formerly the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies), the Fight for Freedom Committee, the Church Peace Union, and the Inter-Faith Committee for Aid to the Democracies. Many have signed interventionist statements issued by special groups or have made public statements of an interventionist character. These include (see New York Times, March 18, April 9, May 9, May 23, June 16, June 15, July 21, July 17, 1941; and Federal Union list of supporters): Margaret Cushman Banning, Stringfellow Barr, Mrs. Emmons Blaine, Clare Boothe, Esther Calkin Brunauer, Lyman Bryson, "Ding" Darling, Russell Davenport, William Alfred Eddy, Charles G. Fenwick, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Henry W. Hobson, Edwin P. Hubble, Frank Kingdon, Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, Max Lerner, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Thomas Mann, Raymond Massey, Helen Hill Miller, Lewis Mumford, Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, Endicott Peabody, Chester Rowell, Robert E. Sherwood, William J. Schieffelin, Ralph W. Sockman, Eugene Staley, Admiral William H. Standley (retired), Lyman Beecher Stowe, Betty Gram Swing, Edmond Taylor, Dorothy Thompson, Mrs. Frank Vanderlip, J. Skottowe Wannamaker, James P. Warburg, William Allen White, Alexander Woolcott, Mary E. Woolley, Rear Admiral H. E. Yarnell (retired), Henry Goddard Leach.

Also listed among the sponsors of the Union-Now Plan are Rear Admiral H. E. Yarnell (retired), Admiral William H. Standley (retired), and Brig. Gen. George V. Strong, present Assistant Chief of Staff of the United States Army (Washington Post, June 18, 1941). This situation was brought to the attention of Congress by Representative GEORGE H. TINKHAM, of Massachusetts, on June 17, when he demanded the removal of these officers who support union of the United States with Britain (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 17, 1941, p. 5266).

Required reading

There are signs of official sanction of the "union now" scheme by other leaders of American destiny. In Senate Document No. 182, Seventy-sixth Congress (a report on schools and training courses in Government departments), it is suggested that there is a tie-in between lectures scheduled by the Department of Agriculture graduate school and the movement sponsored by Federal Union. This report includes the following statement:

"Judging by press releases of the past few months and public utterances of Government officials in high places, the movement has gained such headway as to receive official sanction and advocacy." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 17, 1941, p. 5266.)

The June 1941 issue of Federal Union World boasts that Clarence Streit's Union Now is recommended reading for new officers by the General Staff of the United States Army in a list of recent and standard works. (U. S. War Department Training Circular No. 25.)

ADMINISTRATION PUSHES THE HOLY CRUSADE

The work of these network groups was made much easier by reason of the fact that this administration, unlike the Wilson administration in the early years of the World War, has gone out of its way to foster and promote the idea of the "Holy Crusade."

If time permitted, I could read to you for hours from the multitudinous statements by the President and his official family plugging this slogan. But, instead, I shall merely list a dozen or so statements, taken at random:

President Roosevelt (in his Unlimited Emergency speech of May 27, 1941): "Today the whole world is divided between human slavery and human freedom—between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal. We choose human freedom—which is the Christian ideal."

Vice President Wallace (speech at Burlington, Iowa, on July 31, 1941): "The preservation of liberty itself depends on us. We shall not fail."

Secretary of War Stimson (speech at West Point, N. Y., on June 11, 1941): "To any one brought up in American standards it is an issue between right and wrong, between freedom and slavery, between kindness and cruelty. Such an issue is not subject to compromise."

Secretary of Navy Knox (speech at Boston, Mass., June 30, 1941): "Our world has been challenged by a pagan force that seeks to destroy the very fundamentals of a Christian civilization."

Secretary of State Hull (speech to the American Society of International Law, April 24, 1941): "I have absolute faith in the ultimate triumph of the principles of humanity, translated into law and order, by which freedom and justice and security will again prevail."

Sumner Welles, as Acting Secretary of State (in a speech at the Norwegian Legation on July 22, 1941): " * * * the ultimate victory of the forces of human liberty; of the triumph of civilization itself over the forces of barbarism."

Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones (speech to the United States Chamber of Commerce on April 29, 1941): "We have chosen our course * * * to give all possible aid to those countries which are fighting to preserve their independence and our way of life."

William S. Knudsen, Director General of Office of Production Management in a Fourth of July (1941) message: "The battle of freedom; the battle of the individual against the tyrannical state; the battle of democracy against slavery; the battle of free enterprise against state control of every phase of life from the cradle to the grave."

Postmaster General Frank C. Walker (speech to the National Conference of Catholic Charities at Houston, Tex., on October 19, 1941): "Americans and Catholics, he asserted, could not say of the European war: 'This is no affair of ours. True charity tells us it is not American, it is Catholic.'"

Wendell Willkie, speech on July 4, 1941: "The menace of a doctrine of government and a system of economics that lives by the enslavement of men."

Similar utterances have been made by the following administration spokesmen: Ambassador to England John G. Winant (July 12, 1941); Ambassador to Japan Joseph C. Grew (June 1941); President Roosevelt's lease-lend coordinator Harry Hopkins (July 27, 1941); Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court Frank Murphy (August 19, 1941); Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews, commandant of the third naval district (April 1, 1941); Rear Admiral Harry E. Yarnell (June 7, 1941); Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, who was given a leave of absence from active duty in order to give him time to speak at a series of unity meetings (August 19, 1941); Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt (July 17, 1941); Jerome Frank, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission (February 9, 1941).

ADMINISTRATION AID TO COMMITTEES FOR WAR

But, not content with merely plugging the idea, members of the administration's official

family have gone out of their way to foster and support the activities of the various interventionist committees in the hope, no doubt, that these organizations would be able to bring pressure upon the American people and convert them to the holy cause. I could list for your edification scores of appearances by men in high places in support of the warmongering committees, but I shall content myself again with listing merely a few chosen at random.

You should know that Secretary of the Navy Knox has dared to make official Government material available to such committees. At a rally held at Manhattan Beach in New York City in midsummer 1941, a Navy dive bomber was sent to open the meeting by dropping a parachute with an American flag. On at least one occasion that violent warmonger, Dorothy Thompson, has been invited to "lecture" to soldiers at an Army camp. I know of no noninterventionist who was invited to that camp. Admiral Richard Byrd was given 2 months' leave in order to drum up support for the administration's foreign policy. Mrs. Roosevelt joined an interventionist committee called United Americans (which seems now defunct) endorsed the magazine *Salute*, of the British War Relief Society, and has spoken over the radio under the sponsorship of the Committee to Defend America. (Washington News, May 14, 1941.) Secretary Knox has sent a message of congratulation for its work to that same committee. (Wall Street Journal, July 14, 1941.) Senator PEPPER has spoken for Fight for Freedom. (New York Post, September 18, 1941.) Admiral William H. Standley, retired, spoke for intervention under the auspices of the Committee to Defend America here in Washington on July 27, 1941. (Baltimore Sun, July 28, 1941.) A speaker for that same committee was given time at a water-gate concert here on July 28, 1941, to speak for Battle of the Atlantic Week, fostered by that group (Times-Herald, July 29, 1941), but no noninterventionist spokesman was allowed. Director Knudsen, of the Office of Production Management, spoke at a Fight for Freedom rally in Madison Square Garden, New York City, on October 5, 1941. Codirector Sidney Hillman, of the Office of Production Management, was scheduled to speak at a beat-Hitler rally in New York on July 17, 1941. Civilian Defense Administrator LaGuardia opened a "thumbs up" drive for the British War Relief Society on October 14, 1941. Former Russian Ambassador Davies was scheduled to speak at a Russian war relief benefit in New York on October 27, 1941. Mrs. Winant, wife of our Ambassador to Britain, has spoken at an affair run by Bundles for Britain, and the wife of the former Ambassador to Britain (Mrs. Bingham) is now national secretary of that organization.

This week's press brings the news that George Creel, admitted propagandist for the bloodthirsty during the World War, has joined the so-called Fight for Freedom, Inc. Moreover, this warmongering group which puts the interests of Europe before the interests of the United States, held a meeting in Washington on November 5, 1941. One speaker was our Federal Security Administrator, Paul McNutt. Another was a former member of the British Parliament, Jennie Lee.

Moreover, it appears that the British network has reached even into the American State Department, for on February 15, 1940, in a dispatch from London, the Times said:

"Britain's answer to the United States protest against the seizure of any German exports is expected to be sent soon. The answer has been drawn up for weeks but since the uproar about the British examination of United States mails, the Foreign Office has been cabling all drafts of answers to Lord Lothian. Lord Lothian then goes to the State Department to see what the

officials think of the reply and cables back suggested alterations."

The American Minister to Canada, James H. R. Cromwell, millionaire playboy and former husband of Doris Duke, the "world's richest girl," was so overcome by his love for the British Empire that in a speech in Toronto, Canada, on March 19, 1940, he took it upon himself to spread the defeatist propaganda that "the life, the liberty, the livelihood, and the very safety" of citizens of the United States "may be dependent upon the outcome of this present war." There are many more, but let these suffice.

And, of course, the spirits of the World War returned to the scene of their greatest triumph in an effort to repeat that triumph. Let a few examples indicate that.

On September 2, 1939, the day before the European war began, Frederick T. Birchall, cabled from London that Britain and France "are on the threshold of war." Whereupon, on the same day, the day before the war began, William McAdoo, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Treasury, declared that the United States would enter the war because "I do not believe this country can or will withdraw from the seas in an attempt to isolate itself from the rest of the world." (War Propaganda and the United States, Lavine and Wechsler, pp. 39, 40.)

During September 1939 the interventionist newspaper column, Washington Merry-Go-Round, which frequently reflects administration viewpoints, stated that State Department sources feared that the Allies were doomed unless Americans were in the trenches by Christmas. (Lavine and Wechsler, pp. 44.)

Some say that in the last few weeks the administration has been seeking incidents with which to inflame the American people. A more truthful way of stating the situation would be to say that the administration is becoming more outspoken about its desire for incidents. For as long ago as September 7, 1939, the New York Times, in an "it is learned on high authority" story, attributed to President Roosevelt the prophecy that Americans "will soon realize that they have a direct and tangible stake in the outcome," and that "incidents" (like the sinking of the *Athenia*) "would soon bring America's reaction to the boiling point." (Lavine and Wechsler, p. 44.)

Unable to forget the fat British contracts which his firm executed in the World War, Thomas W. Lamont, member of the house of J. P. Morgan, announced on November 15, 1940, that Britain's sea power and France's "wonderful army, magnificently equipped and led, and backed by the calm determination of the whole French people, so clear to the world" would bring victory. (New York Times.) Apparently Mr. Lamont's reverence for Allied contracts made him overenthusiastic about the possibilities of the French Army.

THE PRESS

What of the propaganda directed toward the American press? The British unquestionably recall the vital part the American press played in selling the idea of American entry into the World War. And, logically, they seek to repeat.

Even the interventionist New York Times has admitted (September 7, 1941) that "at the beginning of the European war the British had a very small 'information' service in this country." They had one press officer and an assistant attached to the Embassy here, and a staff of 15 at the British Library of Information. With each successive change at the head of the Ministry of Information and each successive debate in the House of Commons (all of which have stressed the inefficiency of British propaganda in the United States) new personnel have been added to the staff. "Consequently," continues the New York Times, "there are now 189 persons under Sir Gerald Campbell, who is the head of the British information service in this country."

Of these 189, ninety-nine are employed by the British Press Service, which has offices in Rockefeller Center and in Washington; seventy-four are attached to the British Library of Information in New York and sixteen represent Sir Gerald in New York and in Washington."

We ought to stop right here, and consider the danger. Already, some effect can be noted, although much of the press has remained true to the interests of America. The danger is repetition of the World War campaign.

That the British were justly appreciative of the Anglophiles who control some sections of the press of the United States was recognized in this chamber by Senator Works in a speech on March 4, 1917. He said:

"Mr. President, the newspapers of this country are largely responsible for the condition in which we find ourselves today, and if we shall go to war with Germany the blood of the young men of this country who will be called upon to defend its rights will be on their hands. The Senator who undertakes to do just what I am doing here now in the performance of what I conceive to be my duty as a United States Senator is denounced and traduced by those newspapers for performing that duty. These attacks on him go out all over the country. The columns of these newspapers are filled day after day with misrepresentations, false accounts, insinuating articles that inflame and excite the public mind and arouse the prejudices and the anger and the hate of the American people against Germany. Some people have asserted that they are subsidized by the British Government, but that is not necessary. They are subsidized here at home. Those of them that are not subsidized or bought by selfish interests are themselves willing voluntarily to embroil this Government in a war with Germany in their own interests. Great Britain appreciates this, Mr. President. The English people like that sort of thing. They know very well that they have allies upon American soil. They know that there are thousands of American citizens today who are anxious to have this Nation go to war with Germany, not for the purpose of protecting American lives, but to aid Great Britain.

"I have here just a brief extract from the London Daily Chronicle that shows something of the appreciation of the people over in England, and I will ask that it may be read by the Secretary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it will be read.

"The Secretary read as follows: 'The debt that England owes the newspaper world of America cannot be estimated. The editors of the best journals have been fearless and very shrewd champions of the allies' cause. It is these editors who have made the German monster a reality to the American people, and this quietly and with most deadly logic. We have no better allies in America than the editors of the great papers.'—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. LIV, Part 5, March 4, 1917, p. 4997.)

Furthermore, Capt. Alex Stratford Cunningham-Reid told the British House of Commons on September 11 that British propaganda in the United States should be intensified in order to combat isolationism. "The America First Committee," he said, "last month increased its membership from 10,450,000 to something just over 15,000,000. Even for a country with a population as large as that of America, the organization is extremely large. Using all means at our disposal, we should spend much more money and energy in concentrating on the enlightenment of the American people. By so doing," he said, "we should be forestalling dangerous isolationist propaganda and helping the best friend this country ever had—Roosevelt."

Has there been a back-stage guiding hand this time? There most assuredly has been

and is. We may not know for years who it is, but we can hazard a guess from World War and recent developments.

In the introduction to Capt. Sidney Rogerson's *Propaganda in the Next War*, written in 1938, the well-known British military authority Captain Liddell-Hart, writes: "Large as the part played by propaganda in the war of 1914-18, there is every indication that it will fill a still bigger role in any future great war." Then, of course, the author himself proceeds to tell what the English believe must be done to bring America into the next war; and, as I have already shown, the basis of that action is, as Captain Rogerson phrases it: "The next war will be billed as a fight between democracy and dictatorship. * * * We shall almost certainly represent the struggle in the propaganda we shall be compelled to do toward France, the United States of America, and our own Empire as democracy and freedom versus dictatorship and persecution."

There you are told unequivocally that you are going to be propagandized into Britain's next war—and on what basis you are to be propagandized—and the pattern has been followed exactly.

Now, in prognosticating the coming war, Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, holder of many orders and author of many books, in *Toward Armageddon* (Lovat Dickson, London, 1937), wrote that it would start with what he called "a blue lie." Such lies * * * consist in suppressing that part of the truth which favors an opponent."

"All art," said Michelangelo, "is the expurgation of the superfluous." Feed the people on expurgated, selected information if you would lead them into war.

The greatest of arts is that of influencing people, even to making them give you their money and/or their lives. To do this the first time was not so difficult; but to do it again, just a generation later, is some achievement. It requires a great directing brain, a great artist.

There are those who think that the great change in the attitude of the President and the people over the past year and a half has been due to events. There have been events, but not full comprehension of them or understanding of their backgrounds. It is the way these events have been presented to us that has produced the change in our views, in our emotions.

We are unconscious or unsuspecting of any force at work to stir us up into a state of hysteria, even though we know that Great Britain's need for our resources is greater now than then. But that we have been so worked up no one can deny.

The whole story of how this has been accomplished will be known, as in the last war, only when the participants write their memoirs, and their records are open to public gaze. But we do know that there is evidence of design, that a great artist has been at work, creating a picture which the American people and their administration have accepted.

Who is the great artist? Sir Robert Vansittart, the unknown, the mysterious, is the symbol if not the chief who coordinates all the propaganda services of the Foreign Office and the intelligence services. Like a magician he has kept Americans' attention fixed on unimportant things while he was putting over his trick. His art has been to get us aroused emotionally. Are we? Is his art a success?

H. G. Wells, who has had experience with the personnel of Ministries of Information, in his *New World Order* writes:

"One of the more unpleasant aspects of a state of war under modern conditions is the appearance of a swarm of individuals, too clever by half, in positions of authority, excited, conceited, prepared to lie, distort, and generally humbug people into states of acquiescence, resistance, indignation, vindictiveness, doubt, and mental confusion, states

of mind supposed to be conducive to a final military victory. These people live to twist and censor facts. It gives them a feeling of power."

This Ministry of Information, set up since the war broke, has had successive heads, provided jobs for the deserving, and rumbled as clumsily as German propaganda, serving to distract attention from the smoothly working machine behind the scenes which, under the direction of Sir Robert Vansittart, has so changed American opinion in a couple of years.

The long-time foreign editor of the *New York Times*, the late Eugene C. Young, tells in his *Looking Behind the Censorship* of a reconnaissance he made of the *Times* morgue in search of dossiers on Britain's statesmen. Fat envelopes of press clippings were devoted to the speeches and doings of such persons as Baldwin, Simon, Hoare, Eden.

"Then I turned to look at the clippings dealing with another powerful figure in British international affairs. There was a single envelope, not filled, containing bare details of his career and activities. There were no speeches, no interviews, no exploitation of him. Yet I knew this person, in the time under review, had been the real stabilizing power in the London Foreign Office, the one who always had to be consulted when great decisions were to be taken. * * * Sir Robert Vansittart is the unnoticed man."

After Chamberlain came in as Prime Minister, in 1937, even less was heard or known about the unnoticed Permanent Under Secretary of the Foreign Office, Sir Robert Vansittart, until a loud commotion was raised over the report that he was the author of the Hoare-Laval plot for the partition of Abyssinia.

Then it was given out that Vansittart had retired, that he had been shelved by Chamberlain who himself would take an intimate interest in foreign affairs, because his foreign secretary, Lord Halifax, according to the December 1938 issue of *Fortune*, "has little flair for consecutive thought about English balance-of-power history or the ethics of treaty making. * * * Critics have joked about Lord Halifax's ignorance of Central Europe."

The first knowledge that came to us here in America in regard to his new activities whatever they might be came through *Newsweek*, November 28, 1938. This said: "There's a reason why Sir Robert Vansittart has rarely been heard from since his eclipse in the British Foreign Office. The fact is that he is busy handling one of the nation's most delicate problems—how to combat Nazi and Fascist propaganda abroad."

At the same time, one of those who contributed to the article in *Fortune*, December 1938, on Great Britain's Europe, put it that Chamberlain "politely kicked Sir Robert Vansittart into an upstairs job;" an upstairs and backstage job of directing the British foreign propaganda service.

The result of Vansittart's improved technique and coordinated propaganda services has been most marked in America, as was planned. With enormous stakes to win or lose, ample funds were provided. His organization has functioned so smoothly that it has remained undetected, unsuspected by those in America most affected. In England few know anything about it, as they knew very little about Wellington House. The result is the great change in attitude of the President in several years from the time when he assured us that we would never again go after the "fool's gold" of war profits, to his present dictatorial zeal to enslave liberty everywhere, for religion and morality and his devout belief that these are dependent on the British Empire.

Our leaders of thought have brought the people, just as 25 years ago, from the never again of yesterday to today's inevitability of war, if not over there now, over here

later; and to the attitude that we must give everything to help Britain and to defeat the Axis Powers. This is regarded as due to events, but, of course, it is due to the way the news of the events came to us, and the expurgation and suppression of items that would have been counterbalanced.

The result is that now we are in an emotional state in which we believe that right is all on one side, all evil on the other; that religion, morality, and civilization are fostered only by one side and destroyed by the other. Again we are almost at the point where we may sacrifice everything in the idealistic belief that we can do no other. We must give our utmost to put down evil.

It is the fruition and flowering of the thought expressed by the late Frank H. Simonds in his article, *John Bull's Holy War*, published in the *Saturday Evening Post* of December 21, 1935:

"Once the principle of the criminal nation is established, once the moral duty of the United States to share in the restraint of a 'guilty people' is accepted by the American people, then it must be clear that Uncle Sam is in a fair way, not, as in 1917, to be taken for a ride in Europe alone, but to be presented with a commutation ticket for travel in three continents."

Sir Robert Vansittart, hard-bitten, cynical, may well sit back complacently and smile as he contemplates American hysteria rising as in 1917 and say to himself, "I planned it that way."

And the conclusion, and moral, if any, is found in these final words of Peterson: "To some the history of the 'neutrality' period demonstrates that the United States cannot keep out of war. But the facts do not bear out any such contention. What it does prove is that it is impossible to be unneutral and keep out of war."

Mr. ANDREWS obtained the floor.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ANDREWS. I prefer not to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida declines to yield for that purpose.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is my purpose to detain the Senate for only a few minutes; in fact, it seems to me that the essential issues involved in the joint resolution and proposed amendments have been so ably presented on both sides that I could not be justified in speaking at all, except that I feel I would be remiss in my duties should I not leave upon the record of the Senate some of the reasons which have impelled me to the conclusion that we are taking the proper step for the best interest of our own country in voting for the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 of the so-called Neutrality Act, and particularly section 6, which would allow our ships to arm in self-defense.

I have profound respect for distinguished Senators who have spoken for the opposition. It will be a sad day in our history when all of us believe alike on this or any other momentous question involving our national policy. Exercising our right to free discussion on this floor, we have again shown to the world the American way. It is the only way for free men.

For many years I have occupied important public positions in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government. The greater my experience the more firmly have I become

convinced that in rapidly changing world conditions no public servant should ever pledge what he will do before he knows the facts and what he may have to face. He can never know what may happen. Tomorrow's events may be entirely different from anything heretofore experienced.

We should be big enough and conservative enough and liberal enough to tell the world that we will meet conditions as they arise and will be governed entirely by past experience and the exigencies of the situation, and thereupon act to the best of our ability to safeguard the rights with which we have been entrusted.

Mr. President, I am opposed to sending another A. E. F. to Europe. In fact that question is not here involved. I am likewise opposed to shackling ourselves by retaining upon our statutes a law which recent experience has shown will imperil our chances of adequate protection for our sailors and seamen so long as we have to meet Hitler, who knows no law of the sea and respects no obligation or treaty.

The nations now waging the fight against aggression have plenty of men. They have under their control nearly half the population of the earth. What they need most is what we are furnishing—implements of war. This is a mechanized war. In the wars of today and the future it will be not only the quantity but the quality of the trained soldiers in mechanized warfare that will win battles. We are now fully stressing that policy, and are pressing our industries for the manufacture of implements of war to their fullest capacity. We therefore may be instrumental again in saving the world from domination by dictators.

The main issue in the Presidential campaign in 1920 was whether the United States should join the League of Nations, along with the signing of the Versailles Treaty.

President Woodrow Wilson warned the people of the United States at that time that we might expect another world war within a generation. That prophecy has come to pass.

When Wilson's successor, President Harding, took office on March 4, 1921, that issue had been settled, to remain settled for at least two decades, and thus in the future the people of the United States were to adhere to a policy of passive isolationism. Washington's warnings in his Farewell Address against foreign entanglements have been used practically as the Ten Commandments for the isolationists' concept on that subject. They still seem to adhere to the policy that America should never again assume any further responsibility toward other self-governing nations outside the Western Hemisphere, whether democracies or not.

Woodrow Wilson was crucified in the cause of world peace on a cross of political expediency, and it has taken over 20 years for the world to understand. We did not sign the Treaty of Versailles, or enter the League of Nations. Many statesmen today feel that President Wilson's "lost cause" has resulted in the

second great World War within one generation.

The policy of isolationism likewise blocked the efforts of all subsequent Presidents to have the United States join the World Court. That policy is now working in full force against President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

All our Presidents, since Wilson, have recommended and supported the view that America should do her part in maintaining a World Court and participate in its operation, not merely as a guest, but as a member with full authority to act. It could be a "world court of understanding" with full powers to enforce its decrees. That day will come.

We have learned in the last decade that even one nation can secretly build up a military force that may imperil every free nation on three continents.

In the summer of 1919 it was not possible, and practically since that time it has not been possible for the President, whether Democrat or Republican, to conduct our foreign relations in the orderly way. A minority in the Senate, taking advantage of the rule which permits unlimited debate, has for over two decades exercised the veto on every President and on the majorities in Congress. The effect of this veto has been to compel every administration to inherit the foreign policy and the plan of defense and military preparedness advocated by the minority.

The name of this foreign policy is isolationism, and the strategical plan of this policy is that of the passive defensive, even when faced with another world conflagration against democracy. No President, except possibly Harding, has ever been an isolationist while in office, and certainly the naval and military leaders of our armed forces have never believed in the strategy of the passive defensive; yet the concepts of isolationism have prevailed until now, when we face another European conflagration. There is no doubt that they have had the support, until recently, of large numbers of well-meaning though uninformed people who were misled into thinking that peace can be promoted by inaction, and security by doing nothing. Thus the course we have taken since the end of the first World War has in all its essentials been dictated by the ideology of the isolationists. They prevailed over President Wilson and over Secretary Hughes when he was Secretary of State, and also over Secretary Stimson when he was Secretary of State, and, measured by acts rather than words, they have until recently prevailed over President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull.

It was the isolationists, and not Wilson, who determined the separate treaty of peace with Germany which ended America's part in the World War. They also tied the hands of Hoover when he sought to find a solution for the worldwide economic collapse. They conceived and virtually wrote the Neutrality Act of 1935. They opposed the repeal of the embargo provisions of that act in 1939. The arms embargo feature of the act gravely weakened France and Britain by delaying for many months the development of our airplane and munitions industries in this country. The isolation-

ists have delayed every foot of the way the development of aid to Great Britain, and, though they have been defeated in the argument, the program has been so much delayed, compromised, and confused that what would have been a mighty contribution 2 years ago may now be too late.

Thus, as the result of 20 years of isolationism, the task has been most difficult to make this country secure against the consequences of a policy which has been depriving us of most of our European allies and may, if continued, deprive us of all of them. It may leave us armed but surrounded by an alliance of our enemies on both oceans. For that reason it must be said that our national defense will remain more vulnerable so long as the people do not realize and remedy the deadly error of the strategy to which the isolationist block has committed this country.

The passage of the so-called Neutrality Act in 1935 and its amendment in 1937 were more the result of the ideology of the isolationists than of any other group. I am one of those who looked upon the act with little enthusiasm but ultimately voted for it. I felt that it was a noble gesture in behalf of world peace, directed at the other great nations of the world in the hope that they would either do likewise or that its effect would somehow deter other nations, and especially maritime nations, from stirring up international trouble and becoming international aggressors, as have Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy.

It is an undisputed fact that no nation at any time within the past 20 years has undertaken to seize or transgress upon the soil of either Germany or Italy. While the small independent democracies of Europe, likewise the great democracies of France, Britain, and the United States, rested on their theoretical policy of passive defense, the dictators of Germany and of Italy were training all male children, even from 8 years of age and over, for service of aggression on other nations.

Under the original Neutrality Acts of 1935 and 1937, neither the people of the United States nor the Government could ship any contraband of war to any nation engaged in war. The result was that we amended the act in 1939 when it became clear that we were aiding the two aggressor nations who had secretly armed themselves and were about to declare an "open season" on smaller countries. They later succeeded in crushing to earth one after another 16 nations of contented, self-governing people within the 2 years which followed.

The policy of isolationism might have worked better in early history, when ships conveying cannon and soldiers were propelled only by the uncertain winds, and it required anywhere from 1 to 3 months to cross the Atlantic Ocean before they could even become a threat to the United States or the Western Hemisphere. Today one of our great bombers can take off at dawn on the coast of Europe, and land at twilight on the shores of our own United States.

Today Germany is almost as close, measured by days or hours of transit, to

the United States as was New York to Charleston at the time Washington delivered his Farewell Address. By Morse telegraph, by wireless, by radio, and by telephone, one may speak from any part of the United States to any part of Europe. Today, through these modern mediums, every part of the world is advised as to what is taking place during the day on every battlefield of Europe.

Swift communication between nations has become so common and effective, and our relations so close with other nations, that the United States can no longer disown its obligation to assist other peaceful nations to maintain their national integrity. We have, after 25 years of trial and error, reached the point where we must take our place on the side of the other self-governing nations of the world, or risk an infinitely worse situation. Perhaps, after the present bloody cataclysm of nations is over, we may form some kind of international parliament that will have the power not only to give orders but to enforce them.

The proposed Senate committee amendment to the House joint resolution seeks to repeal sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act, along with section 6 as passed by the House. It is perfectly clear to everyone that the original act has operated to encourage the ruthless aggressions of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, and has forced us to amend this so-called Neutrality Act more than once as the exigencies of the situation have required.

The hour has come when we must again amend the sections referred to so that we can better preserve and defend our rights to the freedom of the seas which we have enjoyed and maintained as an American right for over 150 years. The high seas are not ours, but the inherent right to use the high seas is everlastingly ours, and we shall maintain that right at all costs. The adoption of this resolution will remove the shackles from our own hands, and we can assume our responsibility to render aid as we see fit to those decent, democratic, liberty-loving nations of Europe that have not been able to stem the tide of international vandalism and piracy led by Hitler and Mussolini.

In analyzing the three provisions of the act involved in this joint resolution, and my reasons why I think they will not work today and, therefore, should be repealed, we note:

First. That section 2 makes it unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any nation proclaimed by the President to be at war. This is an absolute abandonment of the long-established right of the United States to the freedom of the seas. Other neutrals have not so shackled themselves. They continue to enjoy the right to trade freely with all neutrals and belligerents in time of war as well as in time of peace, subject only to the exercise of blockade and seizure by belligerents in case the ship seized bears contrabands.

Second. Under section 3 the President is authorized to define combat areas, and by proclamation make it unlawful for any United States vessels to proceed in-

to those areas. The theory and purpose are most commendable. However, we find that Hitler defines combat zones which overlap our combat areas and cover the high seas, and the Germans thus sink our merchantmen and torpedo our warships down in the South Atlantic in areas not defined by the President or by Hitler as combat areas. We thus see how futile the situation has become. It is unbecoming a self-respecting great Nation further to adhere to a policy that imperils our very freedom and encourages at least two aggressor nations, who have sworn our destruction, to take advantage of our generosity.

Third. Section 6, proposed to be repealed by this joint resolution, forbids arming our merchant vessels. The *Robin Moor* was unarmed; so were the *I. C. White* and the *Steel Seafarer* and the *Charles Pratt*; also, the *Pink Star*, the *Sessa*, and the *Montana* were unarmed. Had they had guns on these ships, they would have at least enabled their crews to defend themselves in the American way against submarines and planes. The opponents of this measure would prevent our sailors from arming themselves in self-defense against an aggressor who has threatened their destruction on sight anywhere on the high seas.

Another most potent and obvious reason why we should repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 is that those sections, as now worded, are in conflict with the policy and purpose of the Lease-Lend Act, to which America, through our constituted authority is now committed and upon which mainly depend our practical measures of aid for our own defense.

The opponents would try to lead us to continue a hopeless policy which they claim is the best means of safeguarding the peace of the world and our institutions. Their appeal has the same plausible ring as the war cry of the well-known reactionary forces of France.

The Neutrality Act is one of the most humiliating pieces of legislation ever enacted by the representatives of the American people. Not only does it abrogate the principle of the freedom of the seas—a principle without which a liberal political economy cannot endure—but it deprives the American people of the dignity that comes from facing the truth. By hiding the real issues behind a symptom the Neutrality Act treats the American people as Hitler treats the German people—as a people incapable of reaching decisions on the merits of their case when and wherever it arises. It is thus a step away from democracy. It is a surrender of a sacred self-governing principle.

Freedom is not, and never has been, an easy thing to acquire. It is not, and never has been, an easy thing to hold. The basis of freedom is the most difficult doctrine in the world—the doctrine of the interdependence of human beings. Spiritually we inherit that doctrine from the teachings of Christ. Politically we inherit it from those who framed and adopted our Constitution. We must carry it on. We must, if we want freedom, extend it to new concepts and human aspiration where we have not heretofore chosen to go.

Today the American vanguard of totalitarianism, composed of the bunds, Nazis, Fascists, and Communists, and perhaps sometimes of those taking advantage of well-conceived American-organized societies, has already raised the cry that our President has used subterfuge to deceive the American people.

Let me impress upon the Senate at this trying hour that last November the people of the United States, exercising their right of suffrage, went to the polls and chose Franklin D. Roosevelt President of the United States. He was chosen President of the United States in the way and in the manner provided for in our fundamental law—the Constitution. The people decided in that election who should direct the destinies of this Nation through the emergency which they knew had to come, and has come.

Through our constituted authority, the President appointed and the Senate confirmed our great Secretary of State, whose duty it is, through the thousands of confidential offices established throughout the civilized world, to inform the President and keep him informed at all hours and at all times as to precisely what our relations are and should be with other nations of the world.

We did not choose Charles Lindbergh nor any of his satellites, nor any group or association, to direct our foreign policies. One of the most pitiful displays of conceit perhaps that has ever been witnessed in this country is the effort of our national hero of aviation to try to direct the President and the Congress of the United States as to what they should do. He criticizes the President and Congress as though he himself were America's last, greatest, and best hope. He indicates that he feels that he has been endowed to direct the constituted authority of the people of the United States. The President and our great Secretary of State will direct our foreign policy for this Nation through the present dilemma in the American way, and not through any self-constituted medium who may feel he is the savior of our liberties.

Mr. President, much has been said about alleged broken Presidential promises in debating this resolution and practically every other measure coming before this body which might have some bearing, directly or indirectly, on the present state of emergency. In recent years we have learned that no nation can rely upon the written treaties of dictators who boldly violate them at will. This necessarily forces us to watch carefully the ever-changing international situation, so that we shall not find ourselves clinging to outmoded policies which may seriously menace our security.

Conditions change in this rapidly moving world, and we must prepare ourselves for each threat or fall by the wayside. President Roosevelt should be heartily commended instead of condemned for the realistic point of view he has taken in this time of danger.

There can be no reasonable doubt that everything the President has done has contributed to the strengthening of our national defense. Nor can it reasonably be doubted that he must continue to take defensive, or even offensive-defensive,

steps in the future. That these measures may result in war cannot be denied. But the same thing would be true—and probably more so—of a do-nothing policy on his part.

It should be recognized that the President, by force of circumstances beyond his control, is obliged to deal with a fluid and highly dangerous international situation. For 2 years he has kept this country out of war, and to accuse him of deliberately seeking to involve the United States in war is not only patently false but exceedingly harmful from a domestic standpoint. In the interests of national security, the President's critics, who have so often changed their own position, would do well to abandon their efforts to indict him at every supposed opportunity on the basis of statements made a year ago, and to collaborate with him in trying to guard against the threat of hostilities arising out of the turbulent world situation as it exists today.

In spite of what has been said to the contrary, most of the people of this great Nation heartily endorse and stand by the President they overwhelmingly reelected last year.

The Gallup polls are very informative on this point. On July 19 this poll asked for an answer to the question:

So far as you are personally concerned, do you think President Roosevelt has gone too far in his policies of helping Britain or not far enough?

Persons listed in Who's Who voted as follows:

	Percent
Too far.....	16
About right.....	53
Not far enough.....	31

Add 31 and 53 together, and we have 84 percent that either endorse the President or say he ought to have gone further.

The names were taken from Who's Who, comprising persons who are supposed to be better informed on the conditions of the world, or their names never would have been placed in Who's Who. They are the leading men of the country. The general public voted as follows:

That the President has gone too far, 23 percent.

About right, 55 percent.
Not far enough, 22 percent. Add 22 percent to 55 percent, and we have 77 percent who either endorse the present policy of the President or think he should have gone further.

Mr. President, a small but loud minority continue to shout that the people are not behind the President. The facts, however, indicate the contrary.

The October 16 Gallup poll, taken from the entire Nation in answer to the question "In general, do you approve or disapprove of President Roosevelt's foreign policy?" gave the following:

	Percent
Approve.....	76
Disapprove.....	24

In Wednesday's Washington Post the Gallup poll of November 4 appears. The question asked in this poll was:

Should the Neutrality Act be changed to permit American merchant ships to be armed?

The mid-October poll was 75 percent saying "Yes"; whereas the poll of No-

vember 4 gave 81 percent stating "Yes," that the Neutrality Act should be changed to permit American merchant ships to be armed.

These unbiased and unpolitical scientific polls clearly show that the majority of the people of the United States are in favor of our President's actions as regards foreign policy and fully support the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The isolationists who are storming the country today seem surprised and embarrassed by the fact that they attract to their meetings and their cause many of the obvious enemies of American democracy, including Nazi organizations. The reason is not far to seek. The reason is that the isolationists are constructing a building like unto a house. The beams and the rafters, the mortises and the siding, all fit. The concept of the isolationist has prevented us from opening up a new field of encouragement to small self-governing nations. It has induced a spiritual bankruptcy. It has undermined our dignity as individuals and our faith in democratic argument. It has permitted—and encouraged—the collapse of international democracy. It has propounded and developed the theory of economic self-sufficiency, which is the real economic foundation of totalitarianism everywhere. And now, in the greatest emergency that democracy has faced in modern times, it has encouraged disgraceful criticisms which aid in spreading propaganda that the President of the United States is deceiving us and is not to be trusted.

All those things fit together. There can no longer be any doubt concerning the nature of the edifice which that brand of material will build. Men cannot build good things out of evil things. This is not the house of freedom. It is the house of slavery.

Many of those who oppose the pending resolution likewise opposed the 1939 amendment to the so-called Neutrality Act, and also opposed the Lease-Lend Act of last March and recent amendments thereto. Some of the same opposition favor our intervening in behalf of a so-called negotiated peace. What could we expect in the light of what we know about Hitler?

Hitler had a negotiated nonaggression peace pact with each of the 15 nations of Europe whose people he has since subjugated. He also had a negotiated nonaggression peace pact with Russia, and it lasted only so long as it served Hitler's purpose. Hitler turned on Russia without warning, with the whole force of the German Army.

Hitler himself has boasted that it is only the weak who adhere to treaties; that when any treaty fails to serve his purpose, he would break it as he sees fit.

Some are in favor of a negotiated peace at the present time. A negotiated peace with whom? Not even a moron could, with propriety, enter into a peace negotiation with Adolf Hitler.

When the Senate of the United States rejected the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, we lost our best chance to place our power and influence in a cause which many feel would have

prevented this second World War. Instead, we laid the foundation for our policy of isolationism which was followed through succeeding administrations. We refused to join the World Court. We even entered into a separate treaty with Germany which placed us in a most regrettable position with our comrade nations with whom we had fought for the preservation of democracy.

We all know that the League of Nations was the brain-child of Woodrow Wilson. He made it the predominant effort of his life. At that treaty table our representative, Woodrow Wilson, asked for no territory and no indemnities. His was the only white unselfish hand laid on the treaty table at Versailles. It was the greatest gesture ever made to the world by America. As the apostle of all free people, Wilson formulated and caused to be scattered from the air over Europe the 14 points for peace as an inducement to end that useless, bloody struggle. This was done prior to the armistice. It was repudiated at the treaty table and by the Senate of the United States.

We are again witnessing, in our efforts to further amend the neutrality law, the same opposition which, measured by practicable results, only aids Hitler and Mussolini and operates against the democracies of Europe. The fact is, the original so-called Neutrality Act has never been anything but an un-Neutrality Act. It is un-neutral for any nation to refuse to sell or export goods to any other nation, whether that nation is at war or not at war with another nation. It becomes an embargo which has always given rise to strained conditions between nations whenever resorted to. When we amended that act in 1939 to permit the exporting of all classes of commerce to any nation, whether defending itself against Nazi and Fascist aggression or not, we found it was too late for most of the small nations of Europe. But we tried to make amends for aiding Hitler with our Neutrality Act by repealing the embargo provision and by passage of the Lend-Lease Act which would together permit the United States to become not only the arsenal of democracy but allow the lending, leasing, and exporting of the instruments of war to self-governing nations with which to defend themselves.

The most amazing argument that one can imagine is that which undertakes to convince the American people that to avoid war we must retain the so-called Neutrality Act. The adoption of the pending resolution would not mean war. It would not bring us nearer to war. It would restore us to the status we formerly enjoyed under international law and the law of the seas.

The Neutrality Act is an act of self-abnegation; it is self-imposed and its provisions forged the shackles which have bound only our own hands. It binds no other nation on earth, save our own. It binds us to a pitiful policy which prohibits our own people, whether in time of war or in time of peace, using the high seas to exchange our commerce with other free nations on an equal basis. It prohibits us carrying on other necessary in-

ternational intercourse in a way and manner that has been the custom for over 150 years.

The Neutrality Act is very much like what our lawbooks term a "unilateral contract" or, more properly termed, a unilateral law; a law binding no one except ourselves. Our adherence to it prohibits our use of the high seas in the way we have been accustomed to use them. If we should repeal the whole act, instead of sections 2, 3, and 6, as proposed by the amendment to the resolution, it would merely mean that we would be returning to the international law of the sea and would occupy the same status with all the other nations of the world, which we occupied before the act was first passed in 1935.

The mighty Nazi and Fascist aggressors now devastating Europe were and are highly pleased with our Neutrality Act. They should be. It fitted admirably into their scheme of conquest. Those nations would be highly pleased if the opponents should be successful in defeating the pending repeal measure on the floor of the Senate. It would make large first-page headlines in the German and Italian papers. The attacks on the resolution are highly pleasing to the aggressor nations who have fore sworn our destruction and the democratic way of life.

Mr. President, the only issue in voting on this resolution is whether we shall return to the law of the sea and our free intercourse among nations, which we enjoyed at the time the act of 1935 was passed. No one can seriously argue that we would be violating any obligation to any other nation on earth if we should repeal the whole act. We certainly would not be any nearer war than we are today.

If we had not amended the Neutrality Act in 1931 to allow arms and munitions to be exported from the United States, there can be scarcely a doubt that the British Isles would have been invaded and perhaps occupied by Nazi Germany before the close of 1940.

So we must conclude that if the pending joint resolution is adopted there will be an additional good reason for saying that it will not be necessary for America to send any expeditionary force to Europe. In fact, such a force could not be sent without a declaration of war by Congress, and we pray that that hour shall never come.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bunker	Doxey
Aiken	Burton	Ellender
Andrews	Butler	George
Austin	Byrd	Gerry
Bailey	Capper	Gillette
Ball	Caraway	Glass
Bankhead	Chandler	Green
Barbour	Chavez	Guffey
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Gurney
Bilbo	Clark, Mo.	Hatch
Brewster	Connally	Herring
Bridges	Danaher	Hill
Brooks	Davis	Holman
Brown	Downey	Hughes

Johnson, Calif.	Murray	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Kilgore	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
La Follette	O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah
Langer	O'Mahoney	Tobey
Lee	Overton	Truman
Lodge	Pepper	Tunnell
Lucas	Radcliffe	Tydings
McCarran	Rosier	Vandenberg
McFarland	Russell	Van Nuys
McKellar	Schwartz	Wallgren
McNary	Shipstead	Walsh
Maloney	Smathers	Wheeler
Maybank	Smith	White
Mead	Spencer	Wiley
Murdock	Stewart	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the United States is to go to war then the Congress, as provided in the Constitution, should make a formal declaration of war against the enemies of the United States. There is no such thing as a half-way war, as keeping out of war and getting into war at one and the same time.

The complete repeal of the Neutrality Act means that the United States will at once engage in three modes of warfare—on the sea, under the sea, and in the air. There is only one other way, which is on the land. Those who vote for the repeal of the Neutrality Act will, in my judgment, have voted to put the United States into the war in all four ways. This will have been accomplished without a declaration of war on the part of Congress. Indeed, some of the proponents of the neutrality repeal have even gone so far as to say it is the only way of keeping the United States out of war. Such weasel words, such hypocrisy, are not worthy of consideration. The repeal of the Neutrality Act will in effect accomplish the same result as a declaration of war by Congress. The repeal of the Neutrality Act will put the United States informally in the war against Germany and Italy, and possibly against Japan.

Anyone who votes for complete repeal and who is not in favor of war by this country against Germany, Italy, and possibly Japan, is so devoid, in my judgment, of mental processes as to be a fit subject for a lunatic asylum. He would be guilty of unadulterated hypocrisy. Such an equivocation will give less moral support and stimulus to those by whose side we will then be fighting, or those who sympathize with our side, than a declaration of war would give them. Thus we perform all the tasks incident to war, without achieving the full effect of our action.

Conversely, we will lose the effect upon the Axis Powers of notifying their peoples that we have cast our lot against them, that a mighty nation has entered the lists which will fight to the bitter end to accomplish their defeat.

Thus, while actually voting for war, we do not give our Allies the forthright support, nor deliver the crushing effect against the enemy which a declaration of war would have.

In other words, both at home and abroad, the peoples are deceived. The greatest nation on the face of the earth in its international relations chooses a dishonest, pusillanimous, cowardly, and craven attitude which does not help our friends nor hurt our enemies to the

extent that honesty would. This whole proposition is conceived in deceit, born in intrigue, and reared in camouflage.

If the safety of the United States and the preservation of our institutions and our American way of life depend upon the survival of the Russians, English, and Chinese, and the crushing of Hitler, then in God's name let us take our stand boldly, openly, and fully, and thus make overwhelmingly certain that our side wins and that our institutions and our way of life are safe.

If, on the contrary, our institutions and our American way of life can survive without our engaging in hostilities, then let us not engage in them. Our present course is neither fish nor fowl; it is the usual politically expedient, hit-and-run action of a second-rate, fourth-class, "yes-but" Government.

Primarily, I did not rise to discuss that point, although it is of vital importance. I rose primarily for another purpose. If we are going into this war—and it seems from the President's actions that we have already gotten into it, illegally and unofficially—then I want to remind the Congress of the words of David Lloyd George in the British Parliament. It was he who, after the fall of France and the English evacuation of Dunkirk, summed up the whole debacle with the words, "too little and too late."

If we are going into this war, and do not take to heart the example of England and France, it may lead to catastrophe. If we are going into this war, we must, over and above every other thing, keep faith, be completely loyal, and give unstinted support to the sailors and soldiers. We must give to them the last full measure of our devotion—weapons, powder, guns, tanks, planes, shells, bullets, ships, taxes—every kind of sacrifice in everything we can do. No stone must be left unturned, no effort wasted, no support withheld from those who wear our uniform on the foreign waters of the ocean or on foreign soil. The men in uniform must have the best chance to survive, the best chance to defend their lives, and the best chance for victory which the most powerful Nation on earth can give them.

If we in the Congress vote to put this country into a war, without giving to the men in uniform who are going to risk their lives, who are going to do the dying, our wholehearted and honest support in every way, then the biggest lynching party that ever descended on a capital should string our carcasses as ornaments on the telegraph poles of Washington.

If we are going into this war, there are seven things that are indispensable to fighting it successfully and ending it quickly. Without those seven things, we, in the book of history and before the bar of American public opinion, will be found guilty of having done too little and having acted too late. These seven things are as follows:

First. Henceforth there must be complete frankness by the President, his Cabinet, and the Congress with the American people.

Second. Strikes must end and stay ended during the war.

Third. There must be a drastic increase in all forms of taxation.

Fourth. Every expenditure which is not essential to our national defense, which can possibly be eliminated, must be stopped.

Fifth. There must be a price ceiling on everything—on profits, on wages, on farm products, and all other things.

Sixth. We must immediately double the number of training camps in this country, for we will have need for them.

Seventh. We must immediately commence to raise an additional army, so that the total will not be less than 4,000,000 men, and it may possibly go as high as five or six million men.

These are all locked up in the vote which we are about to take. Unless we are willing to do all seven of these things we will not only not keep faith with our Allies or adequately safeguard our institutions and our American way of life, but we will break faith with those who will make the supreme sacrifice on the ocean's bosom and in foreign lands.

There is no such thing as a halfway war, particularly against the might of the Axis Powers.

What is the situation in this Nation as we are about to embark on this war? First, there is a lack of candor on the part of the President and the Cabinet with the American people. They are treated as if they were mere children. Instead of frankly stating the case and advising them of the President's policy and its implications, there is only deception, misinformation, a withholding of the facts and vacillating leadership from the White House all the way down. We are told after the battle between the U-boats and the destroyers—first the *Greer*, then the *Kearny*, then the *Reuben James*—that there has been no change in the situation. There has been a drastic change in the situation. A reading of the confidential reports of the Navy Department on these three encounters clearly shows that the United States, whether rightly or wrongly, was the aggressor in all three cases, yet when they first happened the public was led to believe that while our ships were proceeding innocently they were fired upon by Axis submarines.

I do not criticize the Navy at all. It was acting under orders from the President without any authorization of Congress to make war upon Axis boats in the middle of the ocean. The so-called Neutrality Act was still on the statute books. Neither the Constitution nor the Congress authorized the President to start this war. Every Senator knows that under our Constitution Congress has the sole and exclusive and absolute power of declaring war. The President, in the pure Hitlerian technique, abrogated to himself the complete power of the Congress. War was declared by Executive fiat and not by the chosen representatives of the people. Yet it had the same effect as if the Congress, in both branches, had voted unanimously for it. If there were need for the warships of the United States to hunt down the warships of any other nation and destroy them in battle, every man on this floor knows that the proper course would be

for the President to recommend to the Congress that it authorize such action.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Senator to say that he has confidential information as to the facts relative to the attacks upon three naval vessels.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. I assume that the facts are confidential.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not disclosed the facts, but I have read the reports, and I am stating only what we all know.

Mr. WALSH. Let me say to the Senator that I have the facts in one instance. A week or 10 days ago I wrote to the Navy Department to ascertain the facts in the second instance, and I have had no reply.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have in my possession the facts relative to all three instances.

Mr. WALSH. There may be this difference: I warned the Navy Department that whatever reply was made, I would feel it my duty to give it to the public. I probably could have obtained what the Senator has obtained as confidential information. Was the letter marked, "Private and confidential"?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and I would not disclose its contents.

Mr. WALSH. My effort to obtain information which I can give to the Naval Affairs Committee and to the public has not been successful to date.

Mr. TYDINGS. The President did not come before the Congress and ask for authority to order our ships to shoot. He snapped his fingers at this body, for he has long since learned that we no longer have a Congress of 531 representatives, and that he may do what he wishes, whether the power be conferred upon him to take such action or not. Now we have an Executive war, not a national war. Thus, while we are going to make the world safe for democracy elsewhere, we are proceeding rapidly to make it unsafe at home. Democracy has quit. Indeed, it has been sick and dying for 4 or 5 years.

A striking example of the lack of candor can be taken from the speech of President Roosevelt delivered on October 30, 1940, in which he actually said:

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Of course, the men on the *Reuben James* were taking part in a purely domestic war. What a graphic picture the *Reuben James* made as she went down in the Mississippi just west of Natchez. Of course, engaging a U-boat in the middle of the Atlantic was not a foreign war. That part of the ocean, of course, is a part of the United States, for its gentle waters roll up to the shores of New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, although those waters have to roll about twelve or fifteen hundred miles to get there.

That is an example of the lack of candor which has characterized the whole conduct of our foreign policy to date.

In the November 1941 issue of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, a spokesman for the President, when asked to explain why the President said this in 1940 and in less than a year after disregarded it, offered this naive explanation. I quote first of all the Presidential spokesman, who, referring in the *Journal* to that speech, stated that the President had used the word "again" only twice. All of us who listened to that great speech remember that the President used three "again's."

But—

Says the Presidential spokesman—
on October 23, 1940, in another speech the President said: "We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes."

Note the use of the word "intervention."

Still quoting:

"I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party," which reads: "We will not participate in foreign wars; we will not send our Army, Navy, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

Those last five words—

Says the Presidential spokesman—
are frequently left out when people quote these speeches, and I think it is important that they should be included, because there are two points that must be clearly defined. One is that no war is a foreign war when it involves an attack on the safety of our country. It is not the place where it is fought which makes it a foreign war.

Let me insert, parenthetically, that that will be much news to all the children from the first grade on in our public schools.

But—

Continued the Presidential spokesman—

It is the question of whether the action impairs the safety of our country. Secondly, what constitutes attack? Does attack only mean the bombing of our native land or the landing on your shores of foreign armies, or does attack mean a threat; some act which will put a foreign power in a position which will endanger the safety of our country?

Then continues the Presidential spokesman:

These questions are rarely discussed by America's first orators. They talk to you primarily about the impossibility of this or that thing happening, and rarely about the possibility of things which are actually happening and their implications.

Continuing, the Presidential spokesman says:

On November 2, 1940, the President said, "There is nothing secret about our foreign policy. The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war. At the same time we seek to keep foreign conceptions of government out of the United States."

Let me again reverently interject, in the language of Shakespeare, "Words, words, words."

Continuing, the Presidential spokesman says in the November issue:

That is why we make ourselves strong. That is why we must muster all the reserves of our national strength. The second pur-

pose of this policy is to keep war as far away as possible from the shores of the entire Western Hemisphere.

This charming, naive, and labored explanation of the difference between the word and the deed would be humorous if it were not so tragic. Is anyone in America so silly as to believe that by attacking before we are fired upon by Axis submarines we shall keep war away from the United States? Does not the Presidential spokesman know what every other person in America knows—that the purpose of those attacks was to defeat Hitler; that the intention back of them was to keep Hitler from dominating the world; that it is not improbable that the only way to do that is to sink his ships, so that those who are fighting against him may survive and conquer? What a charming bedtime story our pleasant Presidential spokesman makes when it is contended that the purpose of these attacks was to keep the war away from the United States. In other words, the way to keep out of war is to get into war. That is the writer's conclusion.

Is this Presidential spokesman of the opinion that by encouraging war with the Axis Powers we keep war away from the United States? Candidly, I have too high a regard for the mental processes of the writer to make any such assumption. I rather think that the commendable loyalty which the spokesman has always exhibited toward our distinguished President inspired this gallant effort to reconcile acts with words. It would be easier to follow our Executive, as I have followed him in the foreign field up to now, if he had said, "Yes; I did make that remark, and I hoped to live up to it when it was made; but as the field of world events unfolds I have reached the conclusion that our safety and our American way of life are so threatened that I now believe another approach to the problem than was contained in my words of a year ago is essential to our own and the world security."

That would have been understandable. However, to have it now said that past and contemplated acts square with the Presidential utterances of October 28, 1940, less than a year ago, is the epitome of disingenuousness.

Every member of this body whose mentality rises above his partisanship knows that our whole foreign policy has been carried on as if Congress were nonexistent, and as if the representatives and the people would fail to respond to candor—candor which alone will do more than all else to unite this Nation in whatever its future may be.

We cannot fight a war successfully without having the Executive inspire in the Congress and the people a faith in his absolute frankness. He will get more help in that way than in any other.

The release of the reports dealing with the encounters of the *Greer*, the *Kearny* and the *Reuben James* set at naught the President's campaign speech of 1940. They show more conclusively than any words of mine can portray the utter lack of candor, the effort to deception, and the complete falseness of the first reports, and the comments thereon, regarding these incidents. Further, let nothing be

said hereafter if it is essential to our safety to withhold facts, or else, in God's name, tell us the truth—one or the other. The time for the treatment of the Congress and the American people as mere innocent children has passed, it seems to me, as we face this great crisis.

Now, to the point: Are we going to continue to wage this executive war and repeal the Neutrality Act without demanding that the conduct of that war shall be in line with that of other wars? Are we, the Congress, going to permit this continued lack of frankness and evasion with the elected representatives of the people? Are we going to continue to sit here and proceed, although the facts are withheld or the news distorted, to cast our votes on our consciences for the national welfare? This is the first thing we must decide simultaneously with the repeal of the Neutrality Act.

Second. We have an Army of about one and one-half million men, partly trained and partly equipped. England has an Army of about two and one-half million men, partly trained and partly equipped. The Russian Regular Army of five and one-half million men, trained and equipped, while giving a heroic account of itself, has lost probably one-half its equipment, one-half its personnel, and one-half its industrial-producing area. Against these losses, the Germans have suffered the loss of 1,000,000 men, considerable equipment of war, and matériel expended in battle; but these losses have been offset by the capture of Russian industrial areas and many supplies with which eventually to replace them.

Thus, at the present time, not counting reserves, the forces of Germany, fully trained and equipped, outnumber the forces of Russia, England, and the United States, which, in large part, are partly trained and partly equipped.

I stated a moment ago that our own Army numbers about one and one-half million men. Like our tentative Allies, our own men are without the tanks, guns of various caliber, the munitions, planes, and other equipment with which this little force of one and one-half million men must likely some day face the greatest military machine in the world.

That is where we stand today as we slide in the back door of what in the end will likely turn out to be a first-class, all-out, fully declared war.

Now to the point: If the numerous strikes in indispensable defense industries had not occurred enough war material would have been produced to add at least 10 percent to the effectiveness of the British Army in successfully resisting an invasion by Hitler, to say nothing of equipping adequately our own forces. Yet, the strike situation continues, with little or no real effort to correct it under a President and an administration which says that it is vital to our own safety that Britain and Russia and China shall not go down before the bloody machine of Hitler. Every time a strike denies to our tentative Allies in this war vital equipment it means not only that a battle may be lost which might have been won, but that human beings may have died who might have lived. In wartime, the cost of strikes is paid with the blood of soldiers.

This tragedy will be reenacted again, and again, and again in our own Army when it, too, takes its stand on the battlefields of the world.

Will the President and the Congress have guts enough to deal with the strike situation? Are we going to recognize the rights of labor and capital, but insist that their difficulties shall be composed without a cessation of the production of the weapons which brave men must have in order to win battles to save their country, to preserve our way of life, and to protect their lives?

Are we going to vote in one breath to draft men from the shop and the plow, the school and the factory, and send them to their graves by the thousands, and then pursue a pusillanimous, political course, and dilly-dally here at home, for fear we will lose some votes on election day?

Unless the President and the Congress—particularly the President—will deal effectively with the strike situation, we can never in our own conscience or before the bar of public opinion, square our lack of action with the Draft Act, wherein we ask no questions, but peremptorily take men, willy-nilly, and send them to the battle front to face a devastating enemy. We say to these youths, "We need you to go forward into the jaws of death to defend our country." Then having taken them, we have a President who refuses to take the leadership in solving our industrial difficulties, but who beseeches and implores instead, while delays go on and strikes multiply.

Do not vote to repeal the Neutrality Act, to have somebody die to save this country, unless you are willing to risk your political lives, too, for those we have ordered to give up life itself, if necessary.

Third. We cannot continue to run this country as we have been running it for the last 10 years, by living on the work of future generations. Before we made a war effort, we had gone into debt \$28,000,000,000 in 10 years, much of it understandable and proper, particularly in the beginning of this administration; but as we emerged from the worst of the depression, it was not excusable or understandable. Always, the Budget was going to be balanced next year, but when an attempt was made to carry out the promise, we were told that to balance the Budget would be to inflict hardships upon the poor. What faulty reasoning! We should have had a system of taxation for the past 5 years which would have brought our expenditures and our income into substantial balance. Now that money is badly needed; and the wastefulness of the administration, its political extravagance, and the use of this money for political purposes, if you please, offer an additional barrier to ultimate victory.

If the United States is going to supply Russia, England, and China with billions and billions and billions of dollars' worth of war supplies, while spending billions and billions and billions of dollars upon our own Army, Navy, and air force, then we have got to double taxation, at least. We have got to tax everybody. We must squeeze the rich until they yell murder, and yell murder again; but we know that

the rich have not enough to pay the bill, and what they would pay would be only a drop in the bucket. So we have got to squeeze the middle classes and the poor, too, and then pass on a large part of the debt to the next generation. Is the Congress of the United States willing to do that in order to support the men who are going to die to save our country? If not, then do not vote to repeal the Neutrality Act. Do not back off from the tough part of your job if you expect American manhood to do the far more deadly and tougher job of protecting this country on the battlefield.

Fourth. This country much cut out all the nondefense expenditures that can possibly be eliminated. That, too, is going to be difficult. Each group hereafter must be told not how much we are going to give them but how much we have for all the people of the whole Nation. If we do not do that, then we cannot ask these boys to die on the firing line for \$30 or \$40 a month while we continue to bail out hundreds of millions of dollars to the folks back home. If that course continues, those who risk their lives will find a ruined country is all they have fought and died to save. That will be the state of the Nation—not for those who have made the supreme sacrifice, but for those who will return with one arm or one leg or one eye, or with no legs at all. Are the President and Congress now willing to take the course suggested? If not, then do not vote for the repeal of the Neutrality Act.

Fifth. There must be a price ceiling put on everything—not only on general goods, but on farm products, on labor, and the profits of capital, too. All must sacrifice and serve when war comes to the Nation. We cannot reconcile in our conscience peremptorily taking a young man from his job of \$100 or \$150 a month and telling him to go out and die for his country at \$30 or \$40 a month while everybody at home enjoys a wave of prosperity and employment beyond the levels of peace. Are you willing, Mr. President; is the Congress willing to do that? If not, then do not vote for the repeal of the Neutrality Act.

Sixth. We must at least double the number of training camps in this country. Hitler, Mussolini, and the Mikado had in their regular armies at the commencement of the present war 13,000,000 men, fully trained and equipped. To date, opposing them are a million and a half of our own, two and a half million in Britain, and five and a half million in Russia; 9,000,000, partly trained and equipped, all told, against 13,000,000, fully trained and fully equipped.

The repeal of the Neutrality Act means war. It has been said over and over again in this country, "If Russia and England go down, we must fight Germany alone." Well, by these words and arguments we cannot afford to take a chance of having to fight Hitler alone with only one and a half million men. We must make up our minds, if we vote for the repeal of the Neutrality Act, to provide the camps to train additional men at once. To do less is to make the sacrifice of the little Army we have but a hollow mockery of justice, a living monument to ingrati-

tude. Yes, more than that, our failure to act will be a glowing tribute to political expedience; it will be exhibit A in the hall dedicated to the failure of democracy.

If we fear that England and Russia may go down—and they may—then in God's name, let us make sure that we stay up, if we are going into this war.

So, Mr. President and Senators, if we repeal the Neutrality Act, then we should immediately double the number of training camps in this country.

Seventh. A corollary to doubling the number of our training camps, which it will take some months to construct, will be the necessity of doubling or tripling the size of our Army and its equipment. We may need them all before it is through. Certainly, we cannot afford to take a chance of not having what is necessary to defend this country if we are now going to war. It will be better to have them and not need them, than to need them and not to have them. That was the reason we voted for a draft act. Then we had not embraced the early phases of a shooting war. There is all the more need that new camps be built immediately, and the Army be doubled or trebled, for if you go into this war you cannot take the chance of losing it.

Now, what does it all sum up to? It means that we are poised at this moment on the threshold of war, not by open declaration, not an all-out war, but a three-quarters war—a war on the sea, a war under the sea, and a war in the air.

When the act is repealed, ships flying the American flag, escorted by battleships, cruisers, and destroyers, will sail through the war zone to the harbors of Great Britain. Submarines and Axis planes will attack these ships. They will fight back. Some ships will go down. Men will be killed and wounded. Passion will run high, and from a three-quarters war, which you will now be embracing, a four-quarters war will ensue. That is the way in which we propose to put this country into a struggle against the greatest military machine the world has ever seen, already fighting on three continents.

Make no mistake about it: We must not go into a war half-heartedly, particularly a war of this magnitude. If this joint resolution passes, there must be henceforth complete frankness by the President with the people of the country. Strikes must end, taxes must be doubled; all nondefense expenditures must be eliminated. There must be a price ceiling on everything. We must double the number of training camps, and double or treble the size of our Army. These things have not been asked for by the Chief Executive, nor have they been advocated by any of the committees or on the floor of Congress.

For my own part I refuse to follow into battle a general who will not keep discipline in his supply lines; for our economic life is our supply line. Without discipline in our supply lines, men will die needlessly on the battle front, die without the means of adequately defending themselves—die for you and for me and for all the other people in America. If they live, they will come back to a country which has won a war only to find

devastation in the economic life back home.

At the present juncture the United States reminds me of a big prize fighter—a prize fighter potentially capable of defeating any and all comers—recognized once as the world's champion, but now grown soft. He is about to issue a challenge to a new, fully trained, and powerful fighter who has loomed upon the heavyweight championship scene. As our fighter gets ready to enter the arena he eats 2 mince pies before each meal, trains hardly at all, and smokes 20 cigars a day. That is a pretty good illustration of our approach to a death struggle with Hitler as we are about to repeal the Neutrality Act.

I have said I would not follow into war a general who will not keep discipline in his supply lines. If we will but remember, that is what happened in France and in England. That is the road they walked; and we have been walking that road, too. We have twisted Hitler's tail on the floor of the Senate and in the White House. We have started a shooting war without legal sanction, while our little Army of a million and a half men walk up and down, up and down, with beer trucks for tanks, wooden clubs for machine guns, and with imaginary anti-aircraft guns to hold off the mightiest military force in the history of the world.

That is where we have gotten the United States in this year 1941. There is little need for me to say more. I was in the last war and had a rather modest but, I hope, useful part in some of the battles that took place over there. After service elsewhere in the front lines I had the distinction of commanding 6 companies of machine gunners, 72 guns, and about 1,200 men. The division in which I trained in the United States never had a machine gun to show us until we landed in France, and then we got our machine guns from the English. When we got to France our artillery was furnished us by the French; and when we fought the Battle of the Argonne we fought it with English machine guns and French artillery to a large extent. Some of the men who went over the top in that battle had not been in the Army 4 months. In one division, I am reliably informed, the new recruits had to be shown how to load their rifles before they went forth into battle.

In my command, the machine-gun units of the six companies of the Fifty-seventh Brigade, there was heavy fighting. We left lots of those fellows over there in France. We would scour the fields at night and get in the bodies that we could not get in during the daytime. These we lined up along the road in scores, and we threw their overcoats over their faces until a trench 18 inches deep could be dug, their bodies placed therein, and the mound and a wooden cross completed the obituaries.

Let me look at the figures of my own outfit, the official report of which I have here on my desk. Of the 1,200 men in my unit there were about 1,000 actually engaged in hostilities at a time. The other 200 were bringing up ammunition, employed as cooks, and the like; but they saw service, too. Of the 1,000 men actu-

ally engaged the record shows that 256, or 25 percent, were killed or wounded, fighting with British guns, with French artillery as support.

I digress here to say that on one occasion when one of these companies had even higher casualties, on the 10th of October 1918, there was no artillery. We were attached to the French, and the artillery was not there; and brave American men went up a hill a half mile long, almost certain that a large number of them were to find their death on that hillside. That was the preparedness of 1918, and it is the kind of preparedness you are giving the United States of America now as you take her into this war. These million and a half men, unless fate fools us very much, may be called upon to face the might of the Axis Powers; and yet strikes go on, and the President begs and implores that there be no interruption in the production of war materials.

You on this floor called those men into the service. I helped to do it. I voted for the law. I did not care what jobs they had; nor did you. We knew we had to get an army together. We sent them to camp; and to this good hour, as we go into this war, there are not more than a handful of divisions—and they are Regular Army divisions—that have their complete equipment.

Are you going to vote this country into war, continue vast expenditures, provide merely piecemeal taxation, and fix no price ceiling which would help save the structure so that they would have something when they come back, and not give them the means of defending themselves when the officer blows the whistle and the moment comes to go?

Those are things to be thinking about when you vote for this Neutrality Act repeal.

Oh, I know "we are going to keep the war on the sea." I wish I thought so. It may be possible. If it is, it will be an achievement which I shall be the first to recognize as one of the greatest handlings of international events in history. But, Senators, wait until the time comes to read the casualty lists, I know the human heart. Let me recall Robert Service's Old Bill. You remember that poem. The man would not go into the war at all; he was opposed to it. "What about the wife and nippers?" he said. Then he read the casualty lists, and he said, "I've got to go, Bill; I've just got to go"; and that is the way it will be.

This country is not prepared. It will not get ready.

We cannot take on 13,000,000 regular soldiers, fully trained and equipped, constituting the armies of Japan, Germany, and Italy—and I am not counting reserves—with a much smaller force of 9,000,000 men in Britain, Russia, and the United States, and they for the most part partially trained and partially equipped. It is necessary to provide the equipment. I have not the figures. Several times the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has stated on the floor of the Senate the figures as to how many planes we could build, and how many tanks we could build. Of course, the figures are not exactly accurate for all the strikes do

not happen in plane factories or in tank factories.

There are Members of the Senate who have in the Army sons who may not be in America 6 months from now, and I say to the fathers, we have not given their sons the guns with which to fight and save democracy, or to save their own lives, and there is not a willingness to do it. We are having a political conduct of preparation for war. Someone has to tell the truth around here after a while.

I mentioned the fact that out of a thousand men actually engaged in 21 days in the Argonne, 256 were killed or wounded. Of course, there was some balm in the fact that we captured more Germans than we had men killed and wounded; but the men who died never knew that.

Then there were the horses of my unit. People do not often think of horses in connection with war; but in the 6 companies I had 56 horses were killed, and 26 more were wounded. Of course, the horses did not know it, but they died in a very good cause. They helped to make the world safe for democracy, because they did their part. They carried whatever there was to carry to the men who were doing the fighting at the front. It was not their fault if the equipment was lacking.

I hope I will not be called immodest for mentioning these incidents. I think they illustrate, more graphically than I can in any other way, precisely what our defense effort means to the men in the service. I mention them to lay the background as I describe the bitter feeling which lies in the breast of the soldier who knows death is just out there, when he hears of the strikes which are taking place back home. It was that way 23 years ago, as it is today. Here he was in the front line trenches, dirty and lousy, muddy, and with little sleep, dying or offering to die for capital and for labor, at \$33 a month, for he got \$3 bonus for foreign service. And while he was dying or offering to die he learned that his service of supply back home had forgotten him. They were greedily reaching for the fleshpots, often oblivious of his sacrifice, leaving him unsupported, either morally, spiritually, or by economic effort. And that is what we are just about to do again. We are commencing it right now.

Yes, we must not interfere with the rights of profit; we must not interfere with the rights of labor. Almighty God, forgive us for our sins. How thoughtless we are, how callous and unfeeling, when it comes to interfering with the lives of young men who will die in the uniform of their country.

I shall vote to arm our ships in the light of the happening of the *Robin Moor*, but I shall not vote to send other men in 1941 to their death in the war zone so long as the leadership of the President and his administration is so steeped in politics that it refuses to give to those who will go to their death the complete devotion and support which their sacrifice should enlist from any government, democratic or otherwise. When this administration and the Congress show a disposition to give to the

young men, who may soon be called upon to fill soldiers' or sailors' graves, the support to which they are, by all the laws of humanity and Christianity and ordinary decency, entitled, then and only then will I take another step such as that which is now proposed.

As I see it, until we do the seven things I have outlined, it would be treason to God, treason to brotherhood, treason to our form of government, treason to the men who wear the uniform of our country to ask them to die to save a selfish nation and a pack of pusillanimous politicians who strut through the halls of power but show no tangible appreciation of the most sublime service of which a human being is capable.

I have watched as we have approached this step. My friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] has a distinguished record on the battlefields of Europe; my friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Clark], with whom I have frequently disagreed, and against whom, on foreign policies, I have frequently voted, likewise has a fine war record, and other Members of this body also have fine war records. I know these men recall the stern days of 23 years ago when men with whom they shared a cigarette or a beefsteak or a can of cold tomatoes were shortly thereafter killed or shot to pieces. I am sure they can recall hearing the distressful and enervating news from home. They can remember the bitterness, the understandable bitterness, when we heard that ships were not being built, that war industries were being closed down because there was an inability to settle disputes between capital and labor. That must not happen in this war. Labor and capital are entitled to their rights, the right to be heard, and their day in court. But if men are ordered by their government to go out on the battlefields and risk their lives, it is the absolute obligation and duty of all others, including government, that there shall be no cessation of the slightest kind in giving these heroes, for that is what they are, the materials, the guns and the weapons with which to fight for their very lives. For to such men on the battlefields, a mere drink of water, a puff off a cigarette, or a can of cold goldfish, is like a year's pay.

I say to you, Mr. President, even though you sit in the White House and occupy the most important position on the face of the earth, do not send the men in the Army and Navy to die unless you are ready to deal more firmly with labor disputes, so that there shall be no cessation in producing the things which our Army must have if it is to win. Until there is some evidence of an earnestness to prepare ourselves, of an earnestness to stop extravagance in nondefense expenditures, to raise more money to pay in increasing amounts for the war production which we must have quickly, to increase the number of camps, to increase the size of the Army, and to deal frankly with the Congress and the people, and stand openly, courageously, and boldly, you shall not have my support to take this country into a war, and break faith with men who have already died by the hundreds, and who will eventually die by the thousands, and perhaps by the mil-

lions, before this undeclared Executive war is over.

I suppose that the hobnailed boots of the Nazi soldiers now tramp the graveyard of Romagne. There were once 25,000 Americans in that cemetery alone. There are some eight or ten thousand whose bodies still lie on the other side. One of them was a boyhood friend of mine. While on recruiting duty in my home town he joined my regiment. On the 10th of October 1918, in the woods north of Verdun, he was crossing a road and was shot to pieces. He was buried by the chaplain in a shallow grave with his overcoat over his face. After the war was over his grave could not be located although many of us searched for it diligently. He was decorated posthumously, and I feel he occupies one of those graves at Romagne about which I have just spoken. His name is on the beautiful temple which overlooked the rows upon rows of white crosses. He is a symbol of the new graves that will shortly have to be dug. He went abroad and after he got over there he was armed with English weapons and French artillery. He might have had a better chance if he had had the weapons on this side, if there had been no strikes to deny their reaching his hands. But now I suppose that does not matter, even though for him there will never be again the rosy glow of sunset nor a deep breath of pure air beneath the Maryland summer sky. No more for his eyes will the morning zephyr ripple across the fields of wavy green wheat. Not adequately prepared, he gave his all. He died for the President of the United States, and for all the Senators in this Chamber, and for all the people in this Nation. He died to uphold the Constitution and the American way of life. That was his contribution to what we statesmen call the preservation of our democratic institutions. And I suppose he is just as well satisfied with his contribution as if his exact resting place were known.

As we bury them in this war, Senators—and they will be buried—let us be justified in conscience so that when we look upon those graves we may honestly say to ourselves: "We did all we could to give you the best chance to defend your lives while you were defending your country and its people."

Until we are ready to do that, using Sgt. James S. P. Fyle as a symbol, I shall not vote to plunge this country into war, and particularly I shall not vote to do it by subterfuge.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had debated in my own mind whether any fruitful service might be accomplished by me by consuming any time whatever in the discussion of the pending joint resolution. I am not egotistical enough to think that what I may say will affect the vote of a single Senator in this Chamber, for every Senator here knows now how he will vote, and I know now how every Senator will vote when his name is called on the roll. But, Mr. President, there are a few things I desire to say in view of my position, and in view of the fact that we are to have a vote before we shall adjourn today's session.

I glory in the fact that I am a Member of a body of men and women who are

not afraid to vote their honest convictions upon a great subject like that which faces us today. Whether Senators agree with me or disagree with me, I am proud to feel that at least they are exercising their own right to follow their own conscience.

I know the roll has been called of votes cast in the past. Some of those who cast those votes passed out of public life, it may be, because of their votes; some of them remain here yet, either because of their votes or in spite of their votes. Those who voted in 1917 are not altogether on a casualty list, politically speaking. Some of those who voted in April 1917 for the declaration of war are still in public life. Many of them are Members of this body. I happen to be one of them. Some of those who voted against the declaration of war in one body or the other are still in public life. The able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] is one of them. There are others.

I am not going to cast my vote, and I hope no Senator, however he votes, is to be charged with having cast his vote, with an eye to the next election. If all of us were defeated in a body the Government of the United States would still go on.

But we are faced with a situation for which we are not responsible, and it calls for courage on both sides. No man can know what the turn of events may bring to him personally or politically or to his country. No man can foretell what public sentiment may be a year from now or 1 month from now. The only guide we can consistently follow in the performance of our duty here is our own conscience, in the light of experience, if we have had it; in the light of vision, if we possess that.

We are not, as a Nation, responsible for the problems which face us today, and on which we are about to vote.

I have not the time nor the disposition, nor has the Senate the patience, to go into the causes of this war or of the last one. We have been a Nation about 150 years. One hundred and fifty years is a very brief period of time, as time is measured. During that 150 years we have grown from 3,000,000 people to 130,000,000.

We have grown from 13 weak, jealous, and disjointed colonies to 48 great States. We have grown from a pauper Nation without standing in the financial markets of the world until we are today the richest Nation that now exists or has ever existed in the history of man. We started out with a little flickering light of liberty set upon a mountain, and that light of liberty has grown until the advent of events which we are now discussing it has been able to shine and cast its effulgent rays into the dark places of the world and inspire men and women everywhere to aspire to and achieve liberty as we have enjoyed it.

During those 150 years we have developed what we call the American way of life. We have owned our homes if possible or we have tried to do so. We have educated our children. We have gone to church. We have developed our individuality. We have done as we

pleased so long as our pleasure did not impinge upon the rights of other men and women, those rights being regulated by organized society. During that century and a half we came to believe that we had enjoyed liberty and freedom so long and so fully that there was no place on earth where it did not exist or where it could be snuffed out.

The World War came in 1914. We were not responsible for it. We had not taken part in any of the events that brought it about. We did not share the racial or religious antagonisms inherited for a thousand years by the people of the Old World. We thought for a while that deep waters and high mountains would protect us from the conflagration that began without our connivance. For two and a half years we tried to remain out. We told ourselves that it was not our war; that we had not begun it and we would not end it.

But the time came, in the spring of 1917, when we discovered that high mountains could not protect us and that deep waters, which might constitute a sort of moat around our castle, no longer prevented the invader from encroaching upon our rights. Incident after incident occurred. Life after life was snuffed out. Ship after ship was sunk. Those were the occasions of our final entry into the World War. But the fundamental thing that drew us in, was our unwillingness to have any autocratic or unfriendly power in Europe drive us from the seas or possess the seas against the interest of the United States.

That war ended. All over the world men, women, and children shouted for joy on the 11th of November, 1918, the anniversary of which we are to celebrate next Tuesday. The war was over. A treaty was made. We may as well admit that that treaty was faulty, and that it contained injustices. But it was made, as most other treaties have been made at the end of every war, by the victors having the largest voice in the writing of the peace treaty.

Then we made more treaties. We had a disarmament conference. We were the leader among the nations of the world. In Washington in 1922 we held a conference among the nations, as a result of which battleships were sunk and blueprints were torn up, and everywhere men and women rejoiced that war was over and that the nations were willing to sit down around a table and try to lift the burden of armaments from the shoulders and hearts of millions and millions of people throughout the world. The Nine Power pact was entered into. The Locarno Treaty was entered into. Then finally, as the culminating, crowning glory, as we thought, of all the peace treaties that have ever been negotiated in man's history, came the Kellogg-Briand Pact, denouncing war as an instrument of national policy. More than 65 nations signed that treaty, and all over the world, in every civilized nation, and even in every benighted nation where men and women had begun to catch the glimpse of a newer and more permanent life of peace and amity, we were told that there would be no more wars and that the world

might forever continue to develop its civilization in the enjoyment of its individual rights.

Then Hitler came into power in January 1933. No sooner had he come into power than he began to talk. These are some of the things he said:

The German people have no thought of invading any country.

Hitler said that on May 17, 1933, less than 4 months after he came into power in Germany.

After the Saar question has been settled the German Government is ready to accept not only the letter but the spirit of the Locarno Pact.

Hitler said that in a speech on January 13, 1934, 1 year after he assumed power.

We have no territorial demands to make in Europe.

Hitler said that in a speech on March 7, 1936.

The lie goes out again that Germany, tomorrow or the day after, will fall upon Austria or Czechoslovakia.

Hitler said that on May 1, 1936.

We have assured all of our immediate neighbors of the integrity of their territory, so far as Germany is concerned. That is no hollow phrase. It is our sacred will. The Sudetenland is the last territorial claim which I shall have to make in Europe. I have assured Mr. Chamberlain—and I emphasize it now—that when this problem is solved Germany has no more territorial problems in Europe.

Hitler said that in a speech on the 28th of September 1938. Mr. Neville Chamberlain, who journeyed to Munich and back to England, as he alighted from his airplane in London, held aloft a piece of paper and announced to his people and to the world that that paper meant, "peace in our time."

Only the warmongers—

Hitler must have coined that word.

think there will be a war. I think there will be a long period of peace.

That is what Hitler said in a speech on January 30, 1939, about 7 or 8 months before war began on the 1st of September 1939.

Mr. Roosevelt believes that the tide of events is once more bringing the threat of arms, and that if this threat continues a large part of the world is condemned to a common ruin. As far as Germany is concerned, I know nothing of this kind of threat to other nations.

That is what Hitler said in a speech on April 28, 1939, only 4 months before the outbreak of war.

It is a plain lie—

He said:

that we have any designs on the American Continent.

That is what Hitler said through his authorized spokesman on October 22, 1941.

I have recited these excerpts from some speeches made by Mr. Hitler to show that from the very beginning of his regime, from the very time when he assumed the chancellorship of Germany, he has been

deceiving the entire people of the world as to his intentions.

I was in Germany in 1936. I was in Frankfurt-on-Main; I was in Dresden; I was in Berlin. I saw what was going on. I saw great airplane factories. I saw great munitions works. I saw great hangars all over Germany. I was taken through some of those things, and they were described to me in boastful language, and there was no effort at concealment; and I was taken through an office building in Berlin, built to house the Air Corps alone; a building as large as any two buildings combined here in Washington today, even in spite of our building program. The mystery to me is that all the nations of Europe, surrounding Germany, with an equal opportunity to know what was developing, took no adequate steps to thwart the diabolical ambitions of this brutal madman whose conception of honor and dignity and conscience, in his dealings with other nations, and with other men, is no loftier than that of the pettiest chicken thief in any part of the civilized or uncivilized world.

We had no part, Mr. President, in bringing about the war of 1914, or of 1917-18. We had no part in bringing about the war now in progress, unless, indeed, it may be said that in 1918 we quit fighting too soon. I am inclined to believe that we did.

I have not the time, nor is it necessary, to go into any detail about the attitude or history of the United States regarding freedom of the seas. I have always thought that God Almighty, in His infinite wisdom, divided men into races and tribes and colors; He bestowed upon them a variety of abilities and talents; they were caused to move hither and yonder, and occupied subdivisions of the earth's surface; but in any of the division of the land among men and among tribes and races and colors, I have never been able to conceive that the high seas were, or ought to be, or were intended to be, otherwise than the highway of nations, the open roadway between peoples, to carry the products of their labor and their toil and their sacrifice to peoples who were without their products and who needed them.

It has been the attitude of the United States, from the very beginning and until now, except temporarily as a result of our domestic policy in this war, to assert and defend the right of our flag and of all flags to sail the seas. In 1912 Woodrow Wilson was elected President of the United States on a platform which declared for toll-free passage for American ships through the Panama Canal. The Democratic platform endorsed that. Mr. Wilson was elected on that platform. It was not a major issue, but it was in the platform. When he was elected, and when a Democratic Congress went in with him, it was not known, apparently, by those who wrote that platform, but it was discovered that in our treaty with Great Britain, by which we were to take over the obligation of building the Panama Canal ourselves, in a treaty into which we entered, we pledged ourselves that all ships of all nations should go through that canal on terms of equality.

That was, of course, intended to include our own ships. Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Wilson had been a candidate on that platform, he came before Congress and asked that Congress repeal the law providing toll-free passage through the Panama Canal, and he stated to Congress, in his message:

I shall not know how to deal with other, larger problems until we have dealt with this one which involves the integrity and the good name of our American Republic in observing its treaty obligations.

There was wide difference of opinion at the time when that matter came up in the Congress; but Congress passed the law, and the question has never been seriously raised from that day to this. We cannot always see far enough ahead to know what our duty may be under conditions we cannot foresee.

We were an advocate of the freedom of the seas, and we went to war in 1776, when there were only 3,000,000 people fringing the Atlantic seaboard—no more than now live in the city of Chicago—and those 3,000,000 people scattered from Maine to Georgia. Those 3,000,000 people went to war for many things, but one of the things for which they went to war was in protest against the navigation laws of the mother country, that denied to the colonists the right to sail their ships and haul their commerce wherever they might desire. I can imagine, and I know from the reading of history, that in the debates in the Continental Congress men objected to the step which was about to be taken for a Declaration of Independence, because it meant that somebody had to die, somebody would lose his life on the battlefield, somebody would go down to a watery grave. John Paul Jones had that problem before him when he led a glorious little American Navy out upon the seas, even across the Atlantic, to help win the independence which you and I enjoy today.

A little later on we went to war, in 1812, to reaffirm and reestablish this right of freedom of the seas. When Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States, without any war, without any declaration of war, Thomas Jefferson told what there was of the American Navy not to huddle in the inlets of the Atlantic Ocean, but to cross the Atlantic Ocean and to go through the Straits of Gibraltar, and into the Mediterranean Sea, to hunt out and fight and destroy and burn and punish the pirates who were seeking to drive our ships from the high seas. Of course, that was an undeclared war but it accomplished its purpose, and it reestablished the American flag where it had a right to be.

Mr. President, my heart is torn and my emotions are aroused by pictures of war and the death of men. I do not contemplate with any degree of satisfaction the death of anybody, on land or on sea. Perhaps our forefathers were wrong about it. Perhaps they ought to have subsided. Perhaps they ought not to have fought for American liberty; but we have raised unnumbered monuments to the heroes of the Revolution because they were willing to take the chance and the risk, not for themselves alone. They could have gotten by with a little stamp

tax. They could have gotten by without unloading the tea in the harbor at Boston. They were not thinking of themselves. They were thinking of what kind of a country they were going to hand down to their children and their children's children. They were willing to take the risks, and they took the risks, out on the seas, and yonder at Saratoga and at Brandywine, and on the snow-clad hills of Valley Forge, where George Washington—who was not regarded as a particularly religious man—knelt and prayed to Almighty God to guide him in undertaking to establish liberty. A British officer, stealing up one cold, snowy morning upon Washington, found him out in the woods behind a stump on his knees praying to Almighty God; and the British officer went back to his commander and said, "We never can defeat an army with a general like that at its head."

They took the risks.

In the war to reestablish our right to the seas in 1812, Commodore Perry took the risks upon Lake Erie. Somebody had to die. Somebody had to go down to a watery grave. Somebody had to be maimed. Somebody had to be crippled. It is a terrible thing to contemplate; but through all history the rights of men and their consciences have been fortified by the willingness of men without number to take the risks in order that liberty might in the first place be established, and in the next place be preserved.

Mr. President, under the agreement we entered into, the hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, I have 20 minutes on the joint resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is 4 minutes past 5 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make no question about minutes. I am entitled to 20 minutes after the hour of 5 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about that; but the Senator announced the arrival of 5 o'clock at 4 minutes past 5.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator wants to quibble over 3 minutes, he has the privilege of doing so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator himself made this agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and I am going to observe it.

The great Civil War came on—the War between the States—in 1861. On both sides, men of courage and determination had to fight a battle in their own consciences as to what their duty was. Gen. Robert E. Lee had been a graduate of West Point. He had been educated by the Government of the United States. Abraham Lincoln offered him the command of the Union Army, and it must have been a very tempting offer to that great American; but he finally announced that his allegiance must go with Virginia when Virginia withdrew from the Union. For 4 years brother fought brother, and neighbor fought neighbor. My own maternal grandfather died from wounds he received in the saddle as a follower of Gen. John H. Morgan. My paternal ancestors fought on the side of the Union. I rejoice that today but one flag floats over the United States of America; but

it took courage. Those men knew they had to take risks, that somebody would die, and hundreds of thousands if not millions did die and suffer, in order that there might be a united nation. We have a united nation today, in spite of surface indications. In spite of all the efforts to disunite it and separate it and divide it, in spite of all the efforts to undermine the confidence of the American people in their Government and in their President and in their Congress, we have a more united nation today than we have ever had before in its history.

All these things required risks. The men who participated in them took chances.

Then the World War came on. The men of that day were not afraid, although they did not relish the necessity. They were willing to take the chance.

We sometimes ask what the result of the World War was. I do not know that there is any answer to that question. I cannot give it. The poet says:

There is a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will.

I believe that in the providence of Almighty God good must come out of that titanic struggle, as, in my judgment, good must come out of this.

Now we are confronted with the problem of 1941. I am unable to say whether the enactment of this joint resolution will bring war. I am not going to undertake to say that it will or will not. I do not know. No man is farsighted enough to see clearly much more than a fortnight ahead. In a certain sense we are not the masters of our fate. We may not be able to determine ourselves whether we should go to war. It may be within the power of another man elsewhere to decide that. Much as I hate war, and much as I detest it—because I have seen it in all its hideousness; I have seen it in the hospitals, in the training camps; I have seen it on the battle fronts—if, when there were only 3,000,000 Americans, they were not afraid to take the chance to establish our Republic 150 years ago; if in 1812, when there were only eight or ten million, they were yet willing to take the chance to establish the right of the American people to the highways created by Almighty God; if they were not afraid to take the chances in 1848, when, as a result of a war with our neighbor to the south, we added nine States to the territory of the Union; if our forefathers were not afraid to take the chances of whatever might be their fate from 1861 to 1865; if in 1898, when we went to war with Spain, not over the sinking of 4 ships or of 10 ships or of 17 ships, but over the sinking of the *Maine*, they were not afraid to take the chance; if we were not afraid in 1917 to send more than 2,000,000 men across the seas in order that we might establish again our right and redetermine it, I do not believe the American people are afraid in 1941 to assume whatever risks they are required to assume in order to preserve everything for which America has stood for the past 150 years.

I do not propose to take advantage of the pending joint resolution to enter into criticism of anyone in the executive

department or to enter into any defense of those who have been criticized here during the debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Kentucky on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will take my time on the joint resolution.

If any mistakes have been made by those in executive authority, if the shortsightedness of mankind has not been overcome, if human frailty has not been entirely abolished, and there have been mistakes, it serves no purpose now, in connection with the pending measure, to parade them before the world and before our enemies.

I wish to say, however, for the President of the United States, that long before this holocaust came, I think he had a vision of what might be. I was a participant in the conference which has been referred to by my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], in his very able and very appealing and logical address delivered here today, upon which I congratulate him. As I listened to my colleague, I felt proud in my heart that he spoke as he did, as a fearless American, taking no account of what may happen to him or the rest of us personally in the years to come.

I was a participant in the conference referred to, in which a very able and very distinguished and very beloved Senator, now gone to his rest, announced that he had sources of information in Europe more trustworthy than the agencies of the United States Government answerable to the Secretary of State, and he took the responsibility of saying that there would be no war. Until the very hour when the war broke upon Europe it was foreordained to be a bloody, and, if not a universal, certainly a long war, because in the city of Paris in the summer of 1938 I was told by a responsible statesman that if war broke out in Europe it would last 6 years at least. I hesitated even to contemplate such a prophecy. But until the very hour of the outbreak of the war no man on earth did more than did Franklin D. Roosevelt to avert it. He went almost on his knees to Hitler and Mussolini, imploring them to avoid this great catastrophe to humanity. Yet he has been denounced as a warmonger, by innuendo and insinuation. He has even been held responsible by some of his enemies for instigating or conniving at the war now drenching the fields of the world in human blood. He did everything he could to prevent it in the outset. He did everything after it began to limit the area of its operation, and in my judgment the course which he has pursued since has met the overwhelming approval of the American people.

He could have pursued no other course, unless we are like a land terrapin, willing, in the middle of the road, to withdraw into our shell and take whatever consequences come as a result of a conflict which rages all around us.

Much as we would like to delude ourselves into the belief that what happens elsewhere does not concern us, we know

now that we cannot insulate ourselves from the electric currents which are flashing in all the skies above our heads. Every thought of our waking hours and every dream of our nightly rest is interrupted by this man Hitler and what he represents. We are doubling our taxes because of him. We are increasing our public debt because of him. Because of him we are reaching into the home of every family and taking out the strongest and the best—and some of them have already gone, either by the summons of their government, or in response to their own consciences. Every prayer we utter to high heaven is colored by the thoughts of what may be the destiny of our Nation.

So far as I am personally concerned, it makes little difference. Most of us here have lived the larger portion of our lives, and sooner or later we will be called to answer on high for the deeds we have performed in the flesh. It makes not much difference to me, so far as my fate or my future may be concerned, but when I look into the faces of my children, and when I look into the faces of my four little grandsons, I ask myself, in God's name, what kind of a nation have I handed down to them? Will they be free? Will they be able to pursue the American way of life as I have pursued it, and as my father and my grandfather and all my ancestors have pursued it? Or shall they be bound hand and foot, and gagged, without the right to free speech, or free worship, or free press, without the right to pursue their individual course and work out their destiny, in a nation of freemen, instead of a nation of slaves?

I do not know whether Hitler can invade the United States physically; I am not a military expert, I am not a senatorial brigadier general. But I know about as much about that as does the average man, and I know that if he conquers Europe he will conquer Africa, and I know that if he conquers Europe and Africa he will conquer Asia, and I know that even now, in order that we may perfect our national defense, we are compelled to bring materials to the United States from across the Pacific Ocean. So that Singapore is important to us, the Burma Road is important to us, Dakar is important to us, all the seas are important to us, and we are not willing to take any chance that, by his further onslaughts upon the rights of men and his conquest of the territory of free nations, he shall jeopardize ours.

There is a type of invasion which may not be physical; it may be moral, it may be mental, it may be economic, and I want Hitler stopped where he is. In order to do that, we have to free our Nation.

We passed an embargo act because we were deluded into believing that if we did not sell to Europe and other nations materials which we did not have, there would not be any war. We found that to be a delusion. In order to get rid of that situation, we had to pass the neutrality law, which tied the hands of our Nation. It has not restricted the aggressors. It has aided them. Now we are confronted with the problem of getting back onto our feet, on the solid ground of our rights, which were asserted

and proclaimed and preserved for 150 years, and because we are trying to regain those rights we are called warmongers, and it is said we want war. If I were polled today upon any street corner and asked if I wanted war, I would say "no," and those conducting the poll would count me in the poll against war. But I am not afraid to accept the responsibility for what my conscience dictates that I do.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senate, and express the hope that the joint resolution will be adopted without amendment as it has come from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lucas in the chair.) The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in 1939 I supported, along with a majority of the Members of this body, the measure which repealed the embargo law and which we now refer to as the neutrality law. At that time I made a short statement which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, giving my reasons for supporting the repeal of the embargo law, and stating among other things that I favor the passage of the so-called neutrality law because it, the neutrality law, prevented American vessels and American citizens from going into the European war zones. I stated at that time that we had believed the cause of America's entry in the World War in 1917 to be due to the sinking of American vessels on the high seas and especially in the then war zones. I believed, as did many others, that America might remain out of the present raging European conflict by the passage of a law preventing American ships from entering belligerent waters. That was 2 years ago. Since that time the picture has changed. What was a European conflict is apparently about to become a world-wide conflict. Within the past 2 years we have seen the aggressor in this war—and by aggressor I mean, of course, the German Nation—override the rights of smaller nations and overrun their countries in a ruthless and cowardly fashion. We have seen this ruthless coward and aggressor practice all forms of cruelty upon practically all nations of the earth. We have seen that aggressor turn upon a friend and ally immediately after issuing a declaration of friendship.

I repeat that the picture has changed. It has changed tremendously. Since the passage of the Neutrality Act, which prevented our vessels entering belligerent waters, we have seen American vessels torpedoed and attacked by German submarines, and these attacks have occurred outside the war zones and in the Western Hemisphere, so the objective we sought to accomplish by keeping American vessels out of the war zones has not been accomplished.

I repeat again that within the past 2 years the picture has changed. It is my sincere and earnest belief that the German Nation strongly desires and intends to carry on, if possible, world

conquest and that domination of the world is their aim. I do not see how any other conclusion can possibly be reached.

I have, of course, only one interest in mind and that is the absolute safety and security of America. The Congress of the United States has appropriated billions upon billions of dollars for national defense, and in the interest of national defense we have aided those whose cause we believe to be in our interest. America has been giving aid to England and to Russia and I think it is right that she should continue to do so, because I believe it to be a certainty that if Germany is defeated there will again be peace in this world, but if Germany is victorious the end of conflict is not in sight of the present generation.

I have said before that I believe England is fighting for many of the same causes in which America believes and, while England is subject to censure for her failure to render full assistance to Russia and others whose interests are at the moment parallel with those of England, still I believe she will continue to fight to the end. Certainly, in the face of all we have done to date, can it be said that a tremendously serious emergency does not exist?

I do not want to see America engage in war, and I hope that actual participation can be avoided; but I am convinced now that America's welfare lies in the repeal of section 6 of the so-called neutrality law and in the arming of American vessels, and I expect to vote accordingly.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, last spring I spoke in the Senate, calling attention to the fact that there was a grave danger of our becoming involved in a shooting war if we should use our warships as convoys to merchant ships which were carrying goods to a belligerent, and introduced a resolution to prohibit the use of convoys. The matter was debated at length and the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I appeared before the committee seeking to have the resolution reported favorably or, failing to get that action, to have it reported to the Senate without recommendation, that it might be voted upon by the Senators.

But the committee declined. The resolution was buried in committee, where it lies today.

Despite the fact that many Senators stated their convictions that convoys would mean war, thus echoing the words of the President himself, who had said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war"; despite the fact that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee himself said he would not sanction convoys until he was ready to declare war, the Senate never was permitted to vote on that vital matter.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee also stated that the President would not resort to convoys without congressional approval.

Time marched on, convoys, the use of which the President had truly said would mean war, were sanctioned by the President without securing congressional approval, and now, in the past 2 weeks, three American destroyers have been

fired on, two of them sunk, and more than a hundred American boys have been killed.

Who authorized the convoys? Not the Senate. Not the House. Not the lend-lease bill which specifically contained a clause stating that nothing in the act could be construed to authorize convoys. No; the one man responsible is the President of the United States, aided and abetted by the Secretary of the Navy, who paradoxically had testified when before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee that he was opposed to convoys, that they meant war, that he was opposed to sending any of our boys to Europe under any circumstances in the present crisis.

To supplement my remarks, Mr. President, I ask that at this point there may be inserted in the RECORD certain excerpts from the RECORD and other data bearing upon this matter, and my own remarks thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in this historic Chamber an earnest and historic debate was recently held, culminating in the passage of the so-called lend-lease bill. That debate was conducted by Members of the Senate in a spirit of sincere and earnest presentation of the facts as they understood them. Many of those who spoke for the lend-lease bill in this Chamber during the several weeks of debate took the position that they were voting for the bill because in their conscientious judgment it was the best means to keep us out of participation in the World War.

In contradistinction, those of us who voted against the bill held that we should vote against it because we honestly believed that it was fraught with the grave danger of making us a participant in the World War. So, sincere men on each side voiced their contentions, the majority prevailed, and the bill became law upon being signed by the President. But from this statement of mine it becomes apparent that all of my colleagues on both sides of that question had in their hearts a hatred of war, a bitterness toward war, and a fear that this Nation might be drawn into the war, that they were opposed to our being drawn into war. As the debate progressed toward taking the final vote on the lend-lease bill, there was but one Senator in this Chamber who came out definitely in advocacy of the United States forthwith going into war.

The gravest issue now before the country is the question of whether or not we will be involved as a participant in this World War. Dr. Gallup, who has been quoted from one end of the country to the other, recently took a poll, as a result of which he certified, I believe, that 83 percent of the American people were opposed to the United States becoming involved as a participant in the foreign war.

With that background I make bold to state that the gravest issue now before the country is the issue of whether we shall go into that war or not.

The factor which in my judgment is most certain to involve us in that war is the issue of whether or not we shall adopt the policy of using our ships and planes as convoys to merchant ships carrying materials to the aid of belligerents.

In section 3, subsection (e) of the lend-lease bill is the following language:

"(e) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of the entry of any American vessel into a com-

bat area in violation of section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939."

Section 3, subsection (d) contains this language:

"(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of convoying vessels by naval vessels of the United States."

While the lend-lease bill was being considered before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, there appeared before us many noted witnesses, not the least of whom was the present Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox. He was asked by one of the Senators, "You stand very much opposed to the idea of convoying merchantmen across the Atlantic?" His answer was tersely and definitely, "Yes."

"You do look upon it as an act of war?"

"Yes," he said.

He made a similar statement before the House committee, in answer to a question from Mrs. BOLTON, a Representative from the State of Ohio. His statement there was that he was very much opposed to the idea of convoying merchantmen across the Atlantic, that he looked upon it as an act of war.

The President himself in a recent statement given to the press made a similar statement. I think his words were:

"Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war."

In confirmation of that I read from a feature article by Frank L. Kluckhohn, appearing in the New York Times for January 22, 1941, in which he says:

"Sources close to the White House said it is obvious that if the United States Navy convoys ships, either under an American or other flag, into a combat zone, shooting is pretty sure to result, and shooting comes awfully close to war."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TOBEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In connection with the authorities which the Senator is quoting on the subject, I think he has overlooked probably the most persuasive authority of all, so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned. If he will permit me to do so, I should like to call attention to the unequivocal statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 6, 1941, as reported at page 1892 in the RECORD. The very distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who piloted the lend-lease bill through the Senate, was speaking:

"As plainly as I can, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war."

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. That is a powerful indictment of convoys.

Mr. President, if it is our conviction that convoys mean war—and we have the eminent authority just cited, as well as the President of the United States and Secretary Knox and many other notable men in this country—we of the Congress having assured the American people that we will keep out of the war, as has the President and as has the distinguished candidate who opposed him in the recent election, then it logically follows that we of the Congress should take every step possible to keep us out of the war as a participant, and should use the powers vested in us by the Constitution to prohibit the use of our ships as convoys.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire mean that the simple act of conveying would be war, or does he mean that the adoption of such a policy would result in acts of war by the other side? Which does he mean?

Mr. TOBEY. I will take as my authority the President's own words, when he said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

Mr. CONNALLY. Evidently the Senator does not care to answer my question.

Mr. TOBEY. I have answered it; I have quoted an eminent authority, and no man should be more obedient to that authority than the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator did not answer my question. I wanted him to answer the question.

Mr. TOBEY. What is the question?

Mr. CONNALLY. The question is, Does the Senator contend that it would be an act of war if we should adopt the policy of conveying vessels; or does he mean that the adoption of such a policy would inevitably result in acts of war by an enemy?

Mr. TOBEY. I will answer the Senator by saying that, in my judgment, it is an act of war for a neutral country to convoy ships carrying supplies to a belligerent.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Texas, who propounded the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator asked a question and then turned his back. Does he desire to have an answer to his question, or not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had answered the question.

Mr. TOBEY. The answer to the Senator's question had been only half completed. More than that, with an abhorrence of war in my heart, an abhorrence which I hope is shared by the Senator from Texas, I think war will be a direct result of such conveying. As the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of our great committee, said, "If we convoy these ships, it means shooting, and that is tantamount to a declaration of war."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not attempting to pass upon the wisdom of attempting to convoy; but it seems to me that the mere act of conveying would not result in shooting unless the other side did some shooting. Regardless of what the President said, the shooting would depend entirely upon whether the other side wanted to shoot at the convoy; would it not?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me answer by propounding a question: Does the Senator agree with the President in his expressed utterance to which I have just referred?

Mr. BARKLEY. I may or may not. I am attempting to ascertain whether the Senator can elucidate what the President meant by mere shooting. The mere conveying of a ship does not mean shooting unless somebody shoots at the convoy. The convoy would not shoot at something just for the pleasure of having target practice.

Does the Senator mean or does he think the President meant that the mere conveying of a ship or of a group of ships across the ocean would automatically result in shooting?

Mr. TOBEY. No. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished majority leader, I will put it this way: It seems to me that what the President had in mind—and it is apparent to all of us—was that if we convoy a group of ships carrying supplies to a belligerent, obviously the enemy of that belligerent is going to take steps to put those convoys out of business; and when, as, and if that occurs the shooting begins, and our ships are sunk, there will be a wave of wrathful indignation that will go over this country and that will arouse the people passionately and earnestly and per-

haps necessarily to cry out and to say, "We will go to war and lick those fellows over there."

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I think that is a deduction that is not farfetched; but when it comes to technical acts of war, the mere fact that one peaceful nation permits a belligerent nation to repair its vessels in its own shipyards would be regarded under what used to be international law as an act of war, the mere lending or leasing or furnishing of equipment for war use might be so regarded. But we recognize the fact that all international law has been thrown out, and, judging by recent events, we see that it is difficult now to draw a comparison between one act of war that occurred when international law had some force and another act of war. So what is the difference, except that one may be more provocative than the other? In legal effect, what is the difference between conveying a ship on the ocean in order to safeguard transport of facilities and supplies to another nation, and permitting that nation's warships to come into our harbors—as we have done by law—and permitting our Government to buy equipment and to furnish equipment and supplies to a belligerent nation, which we have done by law? What is the difference in international law between those two operations?

Mr. TOBEY. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the Senator answer my question first.

Mr. TOBEY. I will be glad to answer it if I understand the Senator correctly, but I will put it this way: The conveying of ships, in my judgment, is the greatest single factor which would bring us into war by its results. There are others that could do so, as I stated on the floor of the Senate when speaking against the lease-lend bill. I felt then, and still hold—I do not know whether the Senator recalls my statement at that time—that when we open our yards to repair belligerent ships, that might well involve us in war, as other things might, but standing out preeminently as a war danger, the danger of involving us in war, in my judgment, is the matter of convoys.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from New Hampshire or of any other Senator, because we have not as yet completed the morning hour and we are anxious to secure action on a couple of appropriation bills, but I wish to ask the Senator a question. Of course, it all depends on whether the nation against whom the operations are directed regards them as a sufficient breach of its rights to make an attack upon us or to declare war. It would have a technical right to declare war on us for allowing a British war vessel to be repaired in the United States; there is no doubt of that, and, under the old conception of international law, they would have the right to declare war against us because we loaned money to one of the belligerents in opposition to that particular country or do any of the things that we can do under the lease-lend bill we have authorized to be done and which are going to be done now—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, morning business is closed. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I was trying to elucidate for the Senator from New Hampshire when the gavel rapped and disturbed the continuity of my thought was that if a nation sees fit to take advantage of the technical violation of what used to be international law to declare war against us or any other nation similarly situated, it could have done so already on the basis of what we have already

done in aid of England or Greece or China. Is not that true?

Mr. TOBEY. I cannot say that is true. Everything is relative in this world, as Mr. Einstein says. Let me ask the Senator, Is he defending convoys?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; the Senator knows that I am not.

Mr. TOBEY. I am asking the Senator in good faith.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I am answering the Senator in good faith; if we have violated international law in such a way as could result in a declaration of war against us by Germany, we have already done that, and the conveying of ships would be only an incident.

Mr. TOBEY. As I said a moment ago, the matter of convoys is the preeminent danger, in my judgment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be so.

Mr. TOBEY. And the President felt so when he made the statement to which I referred, and Frank Knox also said so.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Germany wants an excuse to declare war against us, she has already had it, and we know from her history with other nations that if it was to her interest she would have done it without any excuse.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were an admiral of the German Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a rank supposition.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were Admiral Raeder.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator, in his effort to make me a German admiral, will not give me a name.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were Admiral X, and suppose he knew that the United States was set upon conveying; that we were going to use the convoys to protect the ships carrying supplies and munitions of war, and so forth, to one of the belligerents, it would be natural for him to order submarines to hunt in packs for the convoy, and when they got sight of the convoy to torpedo some of our ships, perhaps carrying 2,000 American boys, and he would then probably expect that the American people would rise up in their wrath and declare war against Germany, would he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. That might result.

Mr. TOBEY. It is perfectly natural that it should.

Mr. BARKLEY. Probably so.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel that the matter of convoys presents a greater danger of involving us in war than anything else?

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be; I am not disputing that; but what I am trying to ascertain is whether the Senator from New Hampshire thinks that Germany would wait if Germany saw it was to her interest to declare war, or whether Hitler would wait, for I do not really like to associate Hitler with Germany, because I have great respect for the German people; I have none for Hitler and I hope the time will come when they will themselves recognize the difference between the German people and Hitler.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that in that respect I agree with him 100 percent, but let me say further with reference to our colloquy here that there is always a straw that breaks the camel's back, and that straw, in my judgment, will be when, as, and if we send convoys to transport goods to belligerent nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. That will depend upon events that we cannot now foresee.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel so, too?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will express my views upon that subject when the occasion has arisen.

Mr. TOBEY. In the words of the advertisement, "If eventually, why not now?"

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it is possible for anybody today, even including the wise Senator from New Hampshire, to foresee conditions that may exist.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, the Senator is a past master of sarcasm that has no place in this Chamber, in my judgment. So I will proceed, if you please.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has my permission to proceed, but did the Senator suggest that I was a psychiatrist?

Mr. TOBEY. No; and neither did I say that the Senator needs a psychiatrist.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am willing to acquit the Senator from New Hampshire of any such need.

Mr. TOBEY. I said the Senator indulged in sarcasm and possibly that that might be out of place at this time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. With reference to the point made by the Senator from Kentucky that these acts in contravention of what was once international law have given the opportunity to certain nations to declare war against us, and they have not done so, let me say that when we send our vessels into the belligerent zone it is going to make us declare war against them.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I am trying to avoid. It is not a question of their declaring war against us but it is the doing of those things which will force the American people to declare war against certain nations.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator, and the Congress and the President having assured the American people they were going to do all they could to keep out of war, then it logically follows that the Congress should take every step to keep this Nation out of war and use all the powers vested in it by the Constitution to prohibit the use of our ships of peace for war purposes. To that end I am introducing a joint resolution, which I will take the liberty of reading. It is as follows:

"Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or conveying articles or materials to belligerent countries

"Resolved, etc., That, except in time of war, hereafter no part of the land or naval forces of the United States, and no vessel documented, or aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States, shall be used, directly or indirectly, beyond the limits of the territorial waters of the United States and its Territories and possessions, to transport or deliver, or in connection with the transportation or delivery of, or for conveyance purposes in connection with the transportation or delivery of, any articles or materials to or for the use of any foreign country with respect to which the President has issued a proclamation under section 1 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, or which is engaged in actual hostilities with one or more foreign countries, even though a state of war has not been declared or recognized in any such proclamation."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention to the language he has used in the joint resolution, "that except in time of war." Of course, this is a time of war. I assume that the Senator means a war in which we are associated?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is correct. I may advise him that I raised that question with the drafting agency of the Senate that helped draft the resolution this morning. They said it was the proper language to use, but I questioned it then, and will be very glad to change it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does not seem to me quite definite enough.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator, and I will change it.

Mr. President, since both groups in the Senate protest that they are opposed to our entry into the war, and since it is undisputed that conveying will definitely take us into the war, this joint resolution provides a means of affording Senators a vehicle to translate their public statements into specific legislation to keep the country from taking this fatal step into war. It presents the issue directly and without equivocation. The people have an opportunity to see whether the administration and the Members of the Senate mean business when they say that they are opposed to our country entering the war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire will be received and appropriately referred.

"The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or conveying articles or materials to belligerent countries, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations."

Mr. TOBEY. Two days ago I introduced a joint resolution to prohibit the use of convoys except at a time when the United States is engaged in war. Speaking on this floor, I prefaced my action with the statement that the joint resolution provides a means of affording Senators a vehicle to translate their public statements into this specific legislation to keep the country from taking this fatal step into the war. I stated that it presents the issue directly and without equivocation, and will give the people an opportunity to see whether the administration and the Members of the Senate mean business when they say they are opposed to our country entering the war.

In view of the oft-repeated assurances by the administration's spokesmen in the Senate that they are opposed to our getting into the war, and that the lend-lease bill was the best means of keeping us out of the war, I was puzzled to see the majority leader of the Senate, who is the administration's official spokesman in the Senate, stand on his feet, and in my opinion, defend convoys.

This was a new departure, a surprising departure, and if, as it would seem, his position reflects the position of the administration, then I say: God help the men and women of this country, for as sure as death follows life, the United States is about to launch into the greatest war in the history of the world—a costly war, a war which will result in thousands upon thousands of American casualties.

The majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], indicated that he could see no difference between the act of conveying and opening up our harbors to the repair of belligerent vessels, of which the Congress has already approved. He said that we have already furnished sufficient provocation for a declaration of war against us by Germany, and that the conveying of ships would "only be an incident."

Only be an incident? Then he treats conveying so lightly? Can it be true that it is in the mind of the administration to launch on a policy of conveying in the face of the President's statement that "conveying means shooting and shooting means war"? And in the face of the statement of the Secretary of the Navy that "conveying means war"?

The distinguished majority leader himself said, in the same debate with me to which I have referred, that if we launch into a policy of conveying, it would probably mean war to this country. And yet he calls conveying "merely an incident."

I asked the distinguished majority leader to indicate if he did not agree that conveying

would get us into the war, and he made a plea in abatement and said: "I will express my views on the subject when the occasion has arisen."

When the occasion has arisen? Has not the occasion arisen now that the Secretary of the Navy has done a complete "about face" and come out in favor of convoys? If we wait for the occasion of actual convoys and wait for war to commence, then the majority leader's suggestion is futile. Blood will already have been spilled.

No; I say the act of conveying is not only an incident. It holds in stake the lives of millions of Americans.

I again turn to the majority leader and ask him to express his views on the subject, not "when the occasion has arisen," for, I say, if eventually, why not now?

Are not the people of this Nation entitled to a frank debate on this vital subject now, while it is on the horizon, looming before us, sponsored by no less an authority than the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, who eats his words, uttered in January, reversing himself? And I ask, Why?

So I make my appeal to the distinguished majority leader to enter into this debate at this time on this profound, far-reaching policy as to the use of convoys.

I address myself now to my friend, the distinguished leader of the great Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Each of us holds him in the highest regard. I say to him that he has set forth his views in eloquent, terse, epigrammatic language in the RECORD, as absolutely opposed to the use of convoys, and said that he himself would not vote for convoys or use his influence therefor unless he was prepared to vote for a declaration of war. I turn to him now, as chairman of this distinguished committee, and say that in his hands there reposes the resolution introduced by the Senator now speaking, and I am asking that the Committee on Foreign Relations be not only the depository for that document which I filed 2 days ago, but that it be considered a live request for information as to facts and policies on the part of the American people, for whom I am one voice, albeit a poor one. I ask the Senator if he will not agree to take this into an executive session for consideration, and report it back, even with no recommendation, so that it will come back for debate here, in order that we who are the representatives of the plain people throughout this country in the hinterland may have an opportunity to go on record either for or against this tremendously far-reaching policy of convoys, which, if persisted in, can result in nothing else but war.

I await the pleasure of the distinguished leader of the majority. Does he care to enter into the colloquy with me this morning? I am addressing the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has a perfect right to address me, but I am not compelled, because he merely addresses me, to enter into a debate with him on a subject which I do not care to discuss at this time.

Mr. TOBEY. There is no compulsion implied or thought of, but I make the suggestion merely because we are here in what is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. If that be true, certainly it is not asking too much that we deliberate on a great question before our people; and they are looking to us, and looking for us not to cover up.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, there is nothing I care to cover up, there is nothing I have ever covered up; but I am not compelled, because I happen to occupy temporarily a position of some responsibility here, to indulge in debate with the Senator every time he brings up a subject.

The resolution to which he refers was referred 2 days ago to the Committee on For-

sign Relations. When that matter will be taken up by the Committee on Foreign Relations I do not know. I do not even know that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman, knows when it will be taken up. When it is taken up it will be given the consideration to which it is entitled, and until that time comes, unless there is an occasion, which I do not now see, when we should enter into a discussion of the subject, I do not see anything to be accomplished by its reiteration.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Will the Senator use his good offices, and his very considerable influence, to see that the committee takes up this matter and brings it back for a vote in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will not make a commitment as to what my attitude will be in the committee until the committee has met and discussed the matter.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator use his influence to have a meeting for discussion in the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Georgia needs no pressure from me or from anyone else to have a meeting of the committee whenever the occasion arises for the committee to meet. To be perfectly frank with the Senator, if he wants a frank answer, I will not attempt to use such persuasion on the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. I now address the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ask him, in all good faith, and with no asperity in my heart, soul, or voice—because of the importance of this resolution, and knowing his views and his frankness and his character and ability, will he not give me assurance that he, as chairman, will have his committee consider the resolution in the near future?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator that this resolution, as all other matters before the committee which are of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of the committee, will undoubtedly have the careful consideration of the committee at a reasonably early time. I am not able to say that it can be taken up tomorrow, or one day this week, but certainly at a very early date. The committee will be back in regular session on Wednesday, and I can assure the Senator that the resolution will be given careful consideration, and, of course, the action taken by the committee will be controlling upon the disposition of the resolution. But there will be no disposition on the part of the chairman of the committee not to give a full and fair and frank hearing upon the resolution.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the assurance.

Mr. GEORGE. There will be an orderly disposition of the resolution by the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. If I may ask one further question, not to press it too hard, but for information, searching for it sincerely, does not the Senator, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, feel in his heart that this matter is so pregnant with direful possibilities for this Nation, and the whole life of America, that the matter should be debated frankly upon the floor of the Senate, and Senators go on record either for or against this far-reaching measure?

Mr. GEORGE. I say to the Senator again that I shall be pleased to bring the resolution before the committee and give it the consideration to which it is entitled; and I recognize the importance of the resolution. The action taken by the committee on the resolution, of course, will be controlling, so far as committee action is concerned. I can assure the Senator that the resolution will be taken up, and taken up in order, and I am sure that the committee will have the fullest opportunity to express itself, and to make such

disposition of the resolution as should be made.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel—again to be specific in my question, and asking for a specific answer—that this matter should be debated on the floor of the Senate, regardless of what the attitude of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be, so that the American people may know the attitude of their representatives in this body on so grave a matter, and we have an opportunity to go on record on it?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to debating it before the Senate and before the country, and I certainly think that all matters of importance—and I regard this as a matter of importance—should be subject to debate before the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the Senator's point of view.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the Senator's prepared remarks today he reported me as having said the other day that the conveying of ships in such a way as to provoke war is a mere incident.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I did.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have examined my remarks, and I can find no such statement. I certainly have no recollection of having made such a statement.

Mr. TOBEY. If I misquoted the Senator, I apologize.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I did say was, and I repeat, that if Germany were looking for an excuse to declare war against this country she could have found that excuse, but judging by her past history she does not need an excuse. She makes war without excuse whenever it suits her. If I made any such statement as that, it was a mere incident, and I have been unable to find it.

Mr. TOBEY. I refer the Senator to page 2708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31. The Senator from Kentucky is recorded as speaking about halfway down the page.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which column?

Mr. TOBEY. The right-hand column, page 2708, halfway down the column.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I am answering the Senator in good faith; if we have violated international law in such a way as could result in a declaration of war against us by Germany, we have already done that, and the conveying of ships would be only an incident.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I did not recall the use of that language. What I meant was, of course, that if Germany desires an excuse to declare war against us, the mere conveying of ships would be an incident so far as Germany is concerned, and the repairing of battleships in our harbors, or our navy yards, or our shipyards, would be a mere incident, so far as Germany is concerned, and the lending of money, or the lending of ships, or the granting of any sort of assistance to England, Greece, or China, or any other of the allied nations fighting Germany, would be, so far as Germany is concerned, a mere incident and a mere peg upon which to hang their hat if they desire to make war against us. If it were to their interest to do so they would not require any such incident even.

Mr. TOBEY. But later on, Mr. Majority Leader, on the same page, in the same column I drew an illustration about a German admiral finding out that we were conveying ships, and attacking us with submarines, and I said:

"Suppose the Senator were that admiral," and I closed by asking the Senator from Kentucky, "and he would then probably expect that the American people would rise up in their wrath and declare war against Germany, would he not?"

Then the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said:

"Mr. BARKLEY. That might result.

"Mr. TOBEY. It is perfectly natural that it should.

"Mr. BARKLEY. Probably so."

So by that statement the Senator from Kentucky put himself on record as saying that the conveying of ships and the resultant sinking of our ships by German submarines would probably involve us in war.

Mr. President, I wish to go on and read to the Senate some excerpts from utterances of distinguished members of this body on the matter of convoys. All these utterances took place during the 2½ weeks we were debating the so-called lease-lend bill which is now law. The utterances may not be in proper sequence. I may have been a little negligent in getting them in proper sequence, but they are important in my judgment, and I shall read them. I quote first from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 1890. The Senator speaking is the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He said:

"But I know that the use of land and naval forces in the delivery of defense articles across the sea would endanger us and possibly involve us in the war."

Then the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] replied as follows:

"Mr. BONE. Mr. President, if we were to undertake the delivery of defense articles, which are commonly referred to as munitions of war, across the ocean, and if we were to convey them with units of the American Navy, it would seem to me an inescapable conclusion that we would with our convoys come almost immediately into contact with submarine, surface, and aircraft units of the German Empire's forces seeking to interrupt the delivery of those articles. I think that can be accepted as a foregone conclusion. Gunfire would ensue. The attack would be repelled. Otherwise we would not attempt to make the delivery; it would be futile."

The Senator from Washington then propounded a question to the Senator from Wyoming as follows:

"Does the Senator from Wyoming believe that if there ensued armed conflict of that kind, which seems to me to be inevitable, we would remain out of war very long—perhaps only for a matter of days?"

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] answered:

"If our forces were attacked or if any convoy our forces were accompanying were attacked, I think that would be an act of war, of course; and I think the country would properly regard it as such."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] then said:

"Obviously it would be difficult to conjure up in our imaginations a more inflammatory or provocative incident or set of incidents than the destruction of the lives of American citizens and the sinking of American vessels.

"Personally, under such circumstances I cannot imagine the United States staying out of war; because no careful reading of history dealing with the period of our national life immediately preceding our entry into the World War reveals any other state of mind than that of almost bitter hatred for Germany, growing out of the sinking of our vessels. Obviously, the delivery under the protection of American warships would invite merely a repetition of such acts. If, as the Senator suggests, we are to be realists, I do not see how we can escape the necessity of contemplating precisely what this problem means."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is speaking:

"Mr. BONE. I cannot escape the conviction that conveying defense materials across the ocean would immediately precipitate warlike acts. I have tried, in intellectual honesty,

to arrive at some other conclusion, and I cannot do so."

The Senator from Wyoming is now speaking:

"I conceive the danger to the democratic principle to be so great that, indeed, it might be proper for this country to run the risk of an actual war; but when that decision comes, I think it ought to be faced here in Congress directly, and not by indirection."

Now the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] is speaking:

"I had from the beginning said I was opposed to convoying, and I thought that the President was well understood as having made that declaration even since the introduction of this bill. It has been published everywhere and I did not think there could be any doubt about it."

"The only way it could be done would be by convoy, and I have always opposed convoy."

That was the Senator from Georgia speaking, and I honor him for his position. He continued:

"Nor have I held the view that American armed forces, military or naval, could be sent anywhere in the world for any purpose. That has not been my view of the Constitution, and it is not now. My view of it has been, without any attempt to indicate all the limitations that must be kept in mind, that, generally speaking, the President may send the Army and the Navy to protect American rights, American property, and the lives of American citizens. That contemplates, in my judgment, primarily defensive action and not offensive action. I very well know that the occasion might arise when it would be said by men of great ability and learning and expert knowledge upon the subject that some offensive action must be taken in order to make the defense perfect and complete, but that is an exception. The broad, general principle, Mr. President, as I have conceived it, without reading any books or authorities, but considering the nature of our Government and the whole genius of the American system, is that the President of the United States, as Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, even in peacetime may protect the lives of American citizens and may protect their property and their rights. I have never conceived that he had any right—and in that sense I use power, for, to me, power is the rightful exercise of the authority claimed by the Chief Executive—to send the Army or the Navy for offensive purposes any place on earth. Therefore, in a bill which gives to the President certain affirmative powers, I have not conceived that it was necessary to negative the use of whatever power, under whatever general principles, under whatever well-recognized limitations or restrictions we have come to recognize as existing."

He further said:

"As plainly as I can say it, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war."

Still further:

"I said a while ago, Mr. President—if this word 'transfer' has any bearing upon the matter—that we will not take the extreme risk of convoying, or of attempting to deliver on the other side of the globe any of the arms or implements of war which we wish to furnish. We will not take the extreme risk of involving our people in war unless, of course, we should be attacked. If we should be attacked, we would do what all of us would, of course, favor. That is a wholly different question."

He further said:

"We are not going to convoy. We are not going to deliver arms and munitions on the other side of the ocean in areas of danger."

This is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] speaking. He further said:

"Mr. President, I do not subscribe now, and I hope I never shall, to the doctrine that we are headed into an inevitable war."

That is "good stuff," Mr. President, if I may use the vernacular.

I now read from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]:

"I said many times in the last campaign that President Roosevelt, in his foreign policy, had not gone too far for me. I said also, time and time again, that I would not vote to send our soldiers into a foreign war. I believed then, and I believe even more strongly now, that we here in the Senate, because of that statement so often made, have the responsibility of doing everything consistently and properly possible to help the President to avoid armed conflict."

I read further from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut:

"Please let us not forget that if in spite of the promises, the solemn pledges of the President of the United States, that there would be no convoying, that none of our boys would be sent to a foreign war, we should send our vessels into combat zones, and those vessels should be subject to assault or attack, it would no longer be a foreign war; it would become our war."

"Congress has the right to guard against that."

That is what motivates me in asking for action on the resolution. In the words of the Senator from Connecticut, Congress has the right to guard against this possibility. The way for Congress to guard against it is to give consideration to a resolution making it mandatory that no convoys shall go across the Atlantic, thereby reassuring the American people of our good faith in keeping the Nation out of war.

In conclusion, I point out that the distinguished majority leader a few minutes ago, in his remarks, suggested that we should wait until convoys are actually sent before starting this—I do not know what he called it—the inference was "hullabaloo," or "outcry," or "campaign" on the floor of the Senate. But let me point out, in all common sense—sometimes I think it is the most uncommon kind of sense around here—that if we wait and take no action on the faith that convoys will not be sent, and they are sent, it will then be too late. Blood will have been spilled. In view of the statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the statement of Secretary Knox, the time to take specific action to prevent this possibility is now. That is why I am on my feet, and that is why I introduced the joint resolution; and that is why, in all good faith and sincerity, and with an earnest desire to be helpful, I ask the majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to let this joint resolution have a hearing, and report it back to the Senate for the vote of the representatives of the people in this country of ours, so that we may know whether or not we are going to keep faith with our campaign promises on both sides to keep this Nation out of war.

Can I better conclude that by reading an excerpt from the Democratic National Party platform of 1940—a declamando statement, if you please? It is the first statement under "We must strengthen democracy against aggression." Here it is. Language is used to convey thought here, I hope:

"The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America."

And my own party, the Republican Party, in its first statement on national defense, makes this declamando statement, in which I concur:

"The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war."

There are 130,000,000 people in this country, and the Gallup poll says that 83 percent of them have expressed themselves against war. All of us who voted on the lease-lend bill, for or against it, with one exception, hope it will keep us out of war. That was the motivating thought in our minds, whichever way we voted. We were sincere and honest in our respective beliefs. That being true, let us keep faith with the people in the hinterlands of America and put up these protestations and these bars to prohibit convoys being used, which in my judgment is the surest means for America to be involved in the war and the blood of American sons to be spilled. God help us to keep faith with the people of this country in this crucial hour in our national history.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, at last the fateful hour of war is upon us, the fateful hour that we noninterventionists have been predicting right along as the inevitable result of the Administration's foreign policy. Step by step, the American people have been pushed toward the brink of fratricidal warfare and now we are hanging over the abyss of the hell of war by a slender thread that will soon be severed. The American people are about to be plunged into the worst blood bath that this world has ever experienced.

We have traveled a long way since the calm and constructive years when the present neutrality laws were enacted. What has come to pass since that period of calm deliberation that should so profoundly alter our national policy and cause us to scatter to the winds the same resolutions that Experience, that cruel but wise teacher, prompted us to take?

To answer that question, to obtain a better perspective, we must step back a little and review some of the events that led to the adoption of our present neutrality legislation.

After the first World War, we know what a sadly disillusioned group of boys were our young men who had torn themselves from their homes to fight on foreign fields to "make the world safe for democracy." Thousands of them never returned, thousands more came back maimed and crippled, thousands more are still lingering on hospital cots, fighting day in and day out. A war which for them has never had an armistice. And mothers and sweethearts, and wives and brothers and sisters and friends shared their disillusionment and felt that their common sacrifices had been made in vain. Oh! true enough, our lads had tipped the scales in favor of an Allied victory, but the "peace without victory" or the "victory without spoils for the victors" that our leaders had promised them had vanished in the international scuffle that took place at Versailles when the secret treaties and ententes were unearthed. They had fought "to make the world safe for democracy" and they had accomplished nothing but to make it ripe for nazi-ism, fascism, and communism.

The common people were not the only ones to share this feeling of disillusionment. Had not the leading protagonist

of intervention, no less a person than Woodrow Wilson himself, come back from the peace conferences in Europe, a disillusioned man? Had he not said when he went to the pier to meet the first shipment of caskets bringing back to this country the remains of American boys, "This must never happen again!" Had he not written the best "epitaph" on the whole episode of American intervention in the World War and given the finest proof of the futility thereof in his statement to James Kerney on December 7, 1923, relative to the policy of Poincaré? He then said:

I should like to see Germany clean up France and I should like to see Jusserand and tell him so to his face. (Cf. *Genesis of the World War* by Harry Eimer Barnes, professor of historical sociology at Smith College.)

Had not Winston Churchill himself said, as late as 1936, in an interview with William Griffin, the editor and publisher of the *New York Enquirer*:

America should have minded her own business and stayed out of the World War. If you hadn't entered the war the Allies would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917. Had we made peace then, there would have been no collapse in Russia followed by communism; no break-down in Italy, followed by fascism; and Germany would not have signed the Versailles Treaty which has enthroned nazism in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war, all of these "isms" wouldn't today be sweeping the Continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government, and if America had made peace early in 1917 it would have saved over 1,000,000 British, French, American, and other lives. (Scribner's Commentator, February 1941, p. 25.)

Numerous articles to that effect had been printed in the press of the United States and in the English press but Mr. Churchill never denied this statement until August 1939, when war was imminent and the United States once more looked like the best source of aid to Britain.

Probably no one expressed the futility of future intervention more clearly than the present Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, in an article found on page 76 of the *Atlantic Monthly*, July 1939.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the *RECORD* at this point excerpts from the article.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

There has never been any successful attempt to deny that the Treaty of Versailles was a monumental act of bad faith. It utterly ignored the implied promises of President Wilson's 14 points. It exacted reparations expressly designed to be impossible of satisfaction. It was not in any sense a negotiated peace. It was a victor's peace imposed upon a vanquished foe. That it contained the seeds of future wars the history of the past 20 years, and the present crisis, abundantly prove. It is to the eternal credit of the United States Senate that it saved us from the ignominy of ratification of such an instrument of international double-crossing. Thus began our process of disillusionment.

The next step in our education as a participant in Europe's affairs had to do with war debts. At the outset of our plunge into the war, our participation had to be confined to providing munitions and supplies.

For this huge sums of money were needed. We supplied them upon a munificent scale. At the time there was little or no thought of their ultimate repayment. We never, in any way, pressed the matter. But when the war was over, wholly upon their own initiative, our associates in the war declared that the sums we had advanced were in the nature of loans, and they themselves proposed settlement. Separate agreements were made, and, on our part, of a most generous character. To the accompaniment of a steady flow of propaganda, designed to belittle and minimize the importance of our participation in the war, the ensuing years saw the gradual repudiation of these debts. This lesson in disillusionment produced the Johnson Act, forbidding any future extension of credit, by the United States, to any nation that had defaulted on its World War debts. No enactment is more firmly buttressed by solid public opinion. Our education was progressing.

Then came the final chapter in the story of our enlightenment. In 1931, Japan, in flagrant defiance of the terms of the Nine Power Pact dealing with the preservation of the integrity of territorial boundaries in the Pacific area, undertook the subjugation of Manchuria. Both Great Britain and the United States were signatories to that pact. Secretly encouraged to do so by Great Britain, we made strong protest against Japan's indefensible attack upon the integrity of China. We had every right to expect vigorous and decisive support from the British Government. Not only was this not forthcoming, but the then British Minister for Foreign Affairs found occasion, upon the floor of the House of Commons, to attempt to justify Japan in her repudiation of her pledged word. Regardless of the embarrassment to us and the impairment of our prestige in the Far East, England had decided that her interests would be better served by letting Japan sate her appetite for expansion in Manchuria, in the obvious hope that this would make south China—where British interests were greatest—safe for, at least, the immediate future. The callousness with which selfish British interests were pursued in this affair completed our education.

The net effect of all this has been to drive in on the American consciousness, with renewed vigor and convincing emphasis, the wisdom of George Washington's warnings to his fellow countrymen, upon the eve of his withdrawal from public affairs, against involvement in European quarrels. So general has this feeling among Americans become that I dare say no proposal could be submitted to the American people to which a more nearly unanimous negative answer would be made than to the question: "Do you want to send another army to Europe and fight in another of Europe's wars?"

There is yet another angle to this pressing question of national defense upon which public enlightenment has made notable progress. We are at last beginning to appreciate, at its full significance, the incalculable value of our insular position. Long, long years ago, Britain learned the military value of her insular position and capitalized upon that knowledge. She knew that she would be safe in her island home if she controlled the seas with which she was surrounded. She achieved that control, and for centuries her soil has been free from the foot of the invader. But, so narrow were the seas upon which her safety depended, the invention of the airplane substantially destroyed this security, and Britain has in effect become a part of continental Europe in a military sense.

But our margin of safety is not narrow. Vast oceans intervene between us and possible enemies, whether they come from the east or the west. Even in the event of wholly unexpected developments in aerial

navigation, it will never be possible to make a decisive attack upon us by air. The worst we have to fear from that direction would be isolated raids of no real military significance. We can, therefore, take for our own the historic British formula for security. Achieving and maintaining a superiority over any enemy or combination of enemies on the high seas, we can make ourselves safe from attack and keep the entire western world secure against the totalitarians. The readiness with which the American public has accepted proposals for rapid expansion of our sea power and the unanimous fashion in which these proposals have been treated by Congress attest to the universality of this point of view.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the worldwide post-war depression which, in the natural and inevitable course of its development, reached this country in 1929, bringing in its wake untold sufferings, hunger, and want, further served to convince the people that our meddling in the affairs of Europe had been a tragic mistake. Too late we realized that our founding fathers had the right idea when they warned this country against foreign entanglements. Too late we remembered George Washington's parting advice in his Farewell Address when he said:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence * * * the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most powerful foes of republican government.

Too late we remembered John Adams' advice:

We ought to lay it down as a first principle and maxim never to be forgotten to maintain entire neutrality in all future European wars.

Too late we remembered Thomas Jefferson's words:

I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. They are nations of eternal war. (Writings, vol. 15, p. 436.)

The American people realized that they had been the unwilling dupes of foreign propaganda, but they resolved with Woodrow Wilson that "this must never happen again!"

That is, in a few words, a brief sketch of the setting wherein the idea of our present neutrality legislation was born. As rapid developments in Europe seemed to point to another World War in the near future and our people became justly alarmed, the Government could not ignore the repeated demands of our fellow countrymen for safeguards that would prevent forevermore sympathetic embroilment of any kind in foreign wars and especially the sending of another expeditionary force to foreign lands.

Accordingly, the period of 1935-39 saw the growth of rigid neutrality laws, based on a searching study of the causes of our involvement in the last war and calculated to nip all future war hysteria in the bud by preventing incidents that would tend to embroil us in foreign conflicts.

Neutrality legislation was not a new development in this country. This Nation had been a pioneer in passing stat-

utes designed to insure our neutrality; this Nation had, as far back as 1794, passed domestic laws designed to help us to live up to our obligations in the family of nations.

However, the recent neutrality laws went further than any neutrality legislation had ever gone before. So great was our desire to stay out of future foreign entanglements that we were willing to make tremendous sacrifices in our world trade in order to avoid all incidents likely to develop war hysteria in this country. We went further than neutrality requires us to go. Neutrality never meant that a neutral nation has to call in its ships in time of war. Still, we decided to do that, so extreme was our desire to avoid participation in foreign wars.

Perhaps we went too far in that legislation. Perhaps it is not a sound policy to give belligerents carte blanche to do as they please during a war. The modern tendency is to encroach on the rights of belligerents, and that seems to be in accord with progressive civilization, because the contrary tends to make war too attractive for nations. If the administration's purpose was simply to eliminate this superimposition upon the concept of neutrality, as known to international law, I might be inclined to support such a revision, but that is evidently not the purpose of the suggested changes, and we all realize that the administration could not, with very good grace, advocate at this late hour a resort to the true concept of neutrality as known to international law. Be that as it may, the fact is that we had a perfect right, if we chose, to be more neutral than the law of nations required us to be. Furthermore, such a strict neutrality law may be justified because of the fact that our close ties of friendship with England make it very difficult for us to adhere to neutrality in a war in which England is involved. This superimposition on the concept of neutrality may be a necessary safeguard to insure our neutrality status in such circumstances.

The fact remains, however, that this law represented the viewpoint of the great majority of our present statesmen and that it met with the approval of the country as a whole.

Mr. President, if you have any doubt of the accuracy of that statement, the quotations I am about to read should soon dispel it.

In connection with his approval of the Neutrality Act of 1935, President Roosevelt said:

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war.

The policy of the Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of any entanglements which would lead us into conflict. At the same time, it is the policy of the Government by every peaceful means and without any entanglements to cooperate with other similarly minded governments to promote peace. (New York Times, September 1, 1935, p. 1.)

When he approved the Neutrality Act of 1936, President Roosevelt said:

By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutral-

ity and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations.

It is true that the highly moral duty I have urged on other people of restricting their exports of essential war materials to either belligerent to approximately the normal peacetime basis has not been the subject of legislation. Nevertheless, it is clear to me that greatly to exceed that basis with the result of earning profits not possible during peace and especially with the result of giving actual assistance to the carrying on of war would serve to magnify the very evil of war which we seek to prevent. This being my view, I renew the appeal made last October to the American people that they so conduct their trade with belligerent nations that it cannot be said that they are seizing new opportunities for profit or that by changing their peacetime trade they gave aid to the continuation of war. (New York Times, March 1, 1936, p. 1.)

When the President approved the Neutrality Act of 1939, he made no statement of policy. The New York Times of November 5, 1939, page 42, commented as follows:

The President signed the resolution and issued his proclamation without any statement of policy other than that contained in his definition of the combat area. As for policy, he stood on his statement at his press conference yesterday that the new law returned the United States to its traditional position of neutrality.

In a special message to Congress on September 21, 1939, the President said:

I say this, because with the repeal of the embargo, this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict. . . . I believe that American merchant vessels should, so far as possible, be restricted from entering danger zones.

As late as October 4, 1941, in an article in Collier's, President Roosevelt said:

This time, after a protracted debate, the recommendations were adopted and a new neutrality law was passed on November 3, 1939—a month and a half after my appeal. The adoption of these recommendations offered greater safeguards than we had before, to protect American lives and property from destruction, and in that way tended to avoid the incidents and controversies likely to draw us into the conflict, as it had done in the last World War.

All those statements were in accord with his previously announced position as evidenced, for instance, by his Chattanooga address on August 14, 1936, when he said to the voters of the country:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in the Continent, let us not blink at the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts; they would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world. It would be hard to resist that clamor. It would be hard for Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace—the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and, for all practical purposes, unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man, who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or the Department of State. We need the meditation and prayer and positive support of the people of America to go along with us in seeking peace.

President Roosevelt was not alone in holding those views. I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks statements made by a number of Senators expressing their approval of the purpose of the Neutrality Act of 1939. Even when the process of emasculation of the present neutrality legislation was begun, namely, with the repeal of the arms embargo, the Senators to whom I refer expressed adherence to neutrality and many pledged to keep America out of war.

I ask unanimous consent to have these statements inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDREWS, CHARLES (Florida): "By this time we should learn that it is not the duty of America to try to bring about the moral reformation of the world, particularly when we find that nearly half the civilized world resents it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 684, October 21, 1939.)

AUSTIN, WARREN R. (Vermont)—inserted in RECORD October 27, 1939, speech made during election campaign of 1938 before the Executives Club of Chicago. In speech he said: "Neutrality cannot be confined to acts of governors. When economic participation expresses popular sympathy with one side only, the government is not neutral, however pacific governors may be." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, pp. 1004-1005, October 27, 1939.)

BAILEY, JOSIAH W. (North Carolina): "I will say that the chief motive that induced me to give my allegiance to the cause of supporting the pending joint resolution was precisely the proposition to withdraw from the waters of the earth our ships, whereby there might be incidents that would arouse our people and change them from their blessed state of desire for peace into a state of contention as to our rights, and finally, into a possible disposition to assert them, go forth in our strength, and pay the price."

"We are not going to get into this war. It is a European war. It is not our war. . . . If we were to get into it, I should think we were the greatest pack of fools history ever recorded." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, pp. 245-246, October 10, 1939.)

BARBOUR, W. WARREN (New Jersey): "What is the best course for the United States in this critical moment?"

"First of all, to keep out of any European war."

"Second. With that consideration in mind, so to shape our acts as to reduce to an absolute minimum the chances that we may be dragged into the war, as we were into the World War, by attacks on American ships engaged in carrying supplies to belligerents."

"Third. After charting our course by these acts and purposes, to go our own peaceful way both on the high seas and at home, meanwhile strengthening our defenses to the point where no other nation or group of nations may attack us with impunity."

"We ought to know by this time—and I think we do—that we cannot change the

habits of the Old World, which has been going to war since before the dawn of recorded history over much the same causes." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 638, October 20, 1939.)

BARKLEY, ALBEN W. (Kentucky): "Why were our people aroused? . . ."

"Because one of the belligerents in the European war was engaged in ruthless warfare against our commerce and our citizens and the rights which they had enjoyed for more than a century.

"The law which we are now proposing would have prevented these attacks upon, and losses of, property and lives, because both property and lives would have been withheld from the regions of danger resulting in their destruction or attack on them. The law we are proposing will keep American ships and American cargoes and American sailors and American travelers out of present regions of danger." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 607, October 19, 1939.)

"So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I am not interested in what England wants or does not want, or what Hitler wants or does not want. . . . I do not want any Member of the Senate to be actuated by the desire of either side as to what we shall do with the embargo and the neutrality law. I certainly am not actuated by any desire on the part of either side." (Vol. 85, p. 729, October 23, 1939.)

BREWSTER, RALPH (then Representative from Maine): "How to keep America out of war is the fundamental issue. There is general agreement that we were drawn into the last war by three primary causes. War passions were inflamed by the sinking of American ships carrying supplies to belligerents and by the drowning of American passengers on belligerent ships. Our self-interest was aroused by large credits to the Allies and the possibility of their loss. Each of these causes is removed by the pending legislation." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 1323, October 2, 1939.)

"America can keep out of this war and the restriction on shipping and credits will be most helpful to this end we all alike desire." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 1323, October 2, 1939.)

BROWN, PRENTISS M. (Michigan): "I do not think it is essential or necessary to the peace and security of the United States for the Allies to win. I put it this way: I think it is better for the peace and security of the people of the United States for the Allies to win; but I do not think it is essential to our peace and security. . . ."

"Because danger is now so remote, I say that there is no necessity of our taking up arms, for I do not believe that in the event of success, even complete success, upon the part of Germany she could dominate the North American Continent or the South American Continent. . . ."

"We could take care of ourselves if Germany should dominate Canada. We could take care of ourselves if Germany should destroy or capture the British Fleet. We could take care of ourselves if the Germanic powers should dominate Europe. We do not want to see any of these things happen; but, in my judgment, none of these considerations are of sufficient force to justify us even in considering entrance into this war. . . ."

"We are not threatened with attack. Even if Germany now foolishly desired to provoke the world's powerful nation by assaulting us, she could not do it. If we go into this war, we shall do so of our own free will. None but the people of the United States will decide that question." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, pp. 644-645, October 20, 1939.)

Byrnes, James F. (South Carolina): "So far as the Senator from South Carolina is concerned, I voted for the war resolution (World War), not to make the world safe for democracy, not at the behest of munitions makers or bankers, but because the German Government, after continued protests from this

Nation, continued to sink American ships, kill American citizens, and destroy American property. I voted as the people of America wanted the Congress to vote, to protect the lives and the property of American citizens whenever they are upon the high seas on peaceful mission bent." (Vol. 85, p. 732, October 23, 1939.)

CARAWAY, HATTIE W. (Arkansas). (Quoted in newspaper article in Washington Post of October 8, 1939, inserted in Appendix by Senator Byrnes):

"I feel very deeply on the subject of neutrality. I don't want to see the son of any American mother go to war. . . ."

"If I thought that repeal of the embargo would lead us into war, I certainly would not vote for it. But I believe, with the restriction the President's bill carries on American shipping to war zones and the cash-and-carry provisions on all shipments to belligerents, that it, if anything will, will keep us out of war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 228, Appendix, October 10, 1939.)

CHANDLER, ALBERT B. (Kentucky): "I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota, however, that he may stand by the side of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; that I will never vote, as a Member of the Senate, to send the boys of America to fight anybody's European war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 423, October 14, 1939.)

CHAVEZ, DENNIS (New Mexico): "I have heard the argument advanced that we are no longer able to live in an atmosphere of detachment from Europe's problems. Yet, what does history teach us in this regard? For some 400 years England, separated from the continent of Europe by the English Channel, a body of water only 22 miles wide, has been able to withdraw at will from the internal affairs of the mainland, remaining secure in her insularity from exterior invasion or aggression. . . . I, for one, feel annoyed at times when I hear the expression that we have to depend upon the British Navy for our peace. How much more fortunate are we in our geographical situation when it is considered that not a mere 22 miles of water, but an ocean of 3,000 miles, helps us to maintain a strategical impregnability." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 316, October 12, 1939.)

CONNALLY, TOM (Texas): "Why are we enacting this legislation? It is not with the purpose of getting us into war; it is to keep us out of war. By this measure we are saying to American citizens, 'You cannot travel to nations at war.' We are telling American shipping interests, 'You cannot go to nations at war.' We go further than that; we give the President the power to superimpose on top of that a declaration of combat areas, and when they are once established, no citizen and no ship can go into those combat areas." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 441, October 14, 1939.)

"American ships, when they go to sea with commerce destined for the nations at war, will be sunk, perhaps, by submarines, regardless of the oratory of those upon those ships or of those of us here at home." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 83, October 4, 1939.)

"That is not the purpose at all. The purpose is to be absolutely fair and impartial between the parties. We are not making war on Hitler, but we do not propose to be his ally and give him aid and comfort which are denied under the embargo act to England and France. That is the answer to the Senator from Connecticut." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 508, October 17, 1939.)

"We were dragged into the World War. I say we were dragged in. We did not want to go in. We were dragged in. We were dragged up to the door several times and then we broke away and we would not go in. Our ships were sunk, our citizens were murdered, just as our ships will be sunk now and our citizens murdered if the embargo is kept as it is written now, because our ships are going to sail from our ports." (CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 92, October 4, 1939.)

DOWNNEY, SHERIDAN (California): "Oh, no, Mr. President; I say we cannot have a divine mission to select nations and arm them to destroy their victims because God has given to none of us the intellectual capacity to dispense such Olympian justice among the ever-quarreling tribes of Europe and Asia." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 915, October 26, 1939.)

"Let us find out where this propaganda comes from which seeks, in my opinion, to delude the American people into believing that we, the people of the United States, are dependent upon the British Navy for our safety here in the New World. I may say to distinguished Senators that that challenge, in my opinion, will never be accepted, because every military expert I have read or talked to has said that within 1 or 2 years the United States could be prepared to defend itself and the Monroe Doctrine against the assault of any possible combination." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 179, October 9, 1939.)

"The first statement they (our political and ruling classes) generally make is, 'We must destroy Hitler, for if we do not, he will come over here and get us.' In 30 minutes it is possible to convince any intelligent man that such a thing is impossible. I have done it in the case of almost every pro-British American citizen with whom I have talked." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 184, October 9, 1939.)

"I have contended that in a year or so the purchasing power of the Allies will collapse. Several million Americans will be working in war industries for them, and we shall then have the stern alternative of precipitating a great crisis of unemployment by shutting off employment for the Allies or the other yet more terrible alternative of beginning the financing of the Allies by credits, as we were beguiled to do in the last war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 185, October 9, 1939.)

"Can the American people, if we would, restore democracy and freedom in that foul cataclysmic Europe which has been devastated now under this one western culture for a thousand years?" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 185, October 9, 1939.)

DAVIS, JAMES J. (Pennsylvania): "The age-long quarrels of Europe and the rivalries of power politics are properly not our concern. We should not allow ourselves to take sides in a struggle which is as old as Europe itself, even though it is now cloaked under new names. No false appeal to the high idealism of the American people should draw us into the present conflict. . . ."

"If the United States should become engaged in war, there is every prospect that we would lose the form of government which we now enjoy, and that the very principle of dictatorship which we abhor would be instituted among us." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 915, October 26, 1939.)

ELLENDER, ALLEN J. (Louisiana): "In conclusion, Mr. President, let us never forget our own avowed determination to keep America out of war. We must not permit our respective constituencies to be swayed by insidious propaganda that may lead them from the path of peace." . . . (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 636, October 20, 1939.)

"Speaking for myself, and for other fathers of fine chaps, I shall not vote, under any circumstances, to send my son or the sons of my fellow Americans to fight the battles of those who inhabit the Old World." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 632, October 20, 1939.)

GEORGE, WALTER F. (Georgia): "Now I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that although credit was not extended directly by the munition makers, was it not one of the chief vices of the 1914, 1915, and 1916 period that credit was extended in the United States for arms, munitions, and war supplies?"

"Mr. NYE. Yes; I think those of us, including the Senator from Georgia, who served upon the committee to which I have referred, came very definitely to that conclusion."

"Mr. GEORGE. Of course, I know the Senator is not unmindful of the fact that in the measure now before the Senate we have pressed our ingenuity almost to the breaking point to prevent the extension of credit for arms, ammunition, and implements of war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 735, October 23, 1939.)

"The point I wanted to bring to the Senator's attention was that certainly in this measure now before the Senate we have gone to the utmost—indeed, I know of no great power in the history of the world that so exhausted its ingenuity as we have in the pending resolution—to prevent the building up of a war economy, at least on a credit basis, which was the vice of conditions which arose in the United States between 1914 and 1916, inclusive." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 735, October 23, 1939.)

GREEN, THEODORE FRANCIS (Rhode Island), from radio address inserted in RECORD by Senator PRENTISS T. BROWN:

"I am convinced that the pending proposals will help to keep us out of war, because they avoid many of the risks and incidents which might bring on war."

"To be sure, these proposals involve sacrifices, real sacrifices."

"Yet we must make such sacrifices if we are to give to our citizens the larger degree of security which they demand, a security which we attain only by preventing the occasions which might incite public war feeling." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, pt. II, Appendix, p. 564, October 27, 1939.)

GURNEY, CHAN (South Dakota): "Some of the good provisions in the joint resolution as it now stands are, in my opinion:

"First. . . . It retains for Americans freedom of the seas in peaceful waters."

"Second. It prevents our ships and citizens from entering danger zones. By these two actions, keeping our merchant marine busy and out of danger, our Navy is sure of the assistance of an efficient merchant marine so necessary in time of national danger."

"Let each Member of Congress make it his job to instill in the hearts of our people his own determination that this country will remain at peace." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, pp. 1008-9, October 27, 1939.)

HERRING, CLYDE L. (Iowa) (radio address, inserted in RECORD by Senator BARKLEY): "The legislation reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee . . . is to reinforce our position as a neutral nation and make more certain the results which all desire to accomplish."

"Our purpose is to strengthen our position as a neutral, not to weaken it. We do not propose to abandon neutrality, but to make it more easily enforceable."

"We desire no war with a foreign power. We are prepared to studiously avoid any possibility of being drawn into the present war or future wars by remaining absolutely neutral in our international relations." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 74, Appendix, October 2, 1939.)

HILL, LISTER (Alabama): "What we want to do is to keep American ships out of the danger zones, so they will not be subject to seizure, or any interference or action by Britain or Germany or any other country." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 829, October 25, 1939.)

JOHNSON, EDWIN C. (Colorado): "Every possible pressure for peace should be brought to bear upon the belligerents by neutral states and the warring nations should be urged to declare an armistice immediately so that the terms of an honorable peace might be worked out around the conference

table. If this war continues millions of women and children will be starved by the blockades, millions of men slaughtered at the front, and billions of taxpayers' dollars will be squandered. While such a fire rages no one's peace will be safe. * * *

"The best insurance for keeping America out of the European war will be to stop that war now." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 82, October 4, 1939.)

"I have no qualms about voting for the repeal of the present arms embargo, but when I vote that legislation out I want to vote restrictive legislation in to take its place which will keep us out of war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 831, October 25, 1939.)

LEE, JOSH (Oklahoma): "The purpose of the proposed neutrality law is to prevent war; it is a preventive measure. * * *

"Mr. President, those who have written to me are laboring under the impression that if we pass the Pittman measure we are repealing neutrality. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are revitalizing neutrality. We are putting more teeth in the Neutrality Act than it ever had. * * * (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 1007, October 27, 1939.)

LUCAS, SCOTT W. (Illinois): "I submit that this is not our war. We must stay out, and I say that we will stay out because of the sentiment of the American people at the present time. Out of the 100,000 telegrams, postal cards, and letters that have come to my desk, all from Illinois, there are various views expressed as to what should or should not be done with the Embargo Act, but there is not a single letter in which there is the slightest trace of the militaristic spirit that some people would want us to believe exists in this country today. Every single one concludes in one form or another, 'Mr. Senator, do what you can to keep us out of war.'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 647, October 20, 1939.)

LUCAS, SCOTT W. (Illinois): "I repeat that so long as I am a Member of the Senate I will vote, if necessary, billions of dollars for the defense of our shores, but the senior Senator from Illinois will never vote a dime to send American boys across the ocean to pull the chestnuts of some other nation out of the international fire. * * *

"Let us stay out, Mr. President, because when this holocaust of hell has been finished across the sea, if European civilization is not destroyed, it will be seriously crippled. The Old World will need America to bind up her wounds and keep civilization from completely collapsing." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 652, October 20, 1939.)

MALONEY, FRANCIS (Connecticut): "Let me say at this time, Mr. President, that if there is reason for any nations in Europe to believe, or to entertain the serious hope, that at some later date we may enter this war, no ground for such belief has been afforded by those who favor repealing the arms embargo. * * *

"Let me serve notice, if my feeble voice can in any degree serve notice, that we will not later treat seriously any cry that we were willing to sell munitions abroad for a profit while there was cash, but would refrain from selling them when cash was exhausted. I want to make that statement clear, so I shall take the time here and now briefly to re-explain my view on that part of the joint resolution which is the real bone of contention." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 501, October 17, 1939.)

"I do not believe our boys will participate in this war, or that they will ever engage in any war across the seas, except by direction of the vote of the American people. On that I shall say 'no.'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 503, October 17, 1939.)

"It has been pointed out in the debate by one distinguished Senator after another that if we should enter the war we could suffer regimentation and probably repudiation, as well as deflation. Let no one mistake the

possible accuracy of those statements. If we should enter the war, we probably could not escape the dangers referred to; but if our Congress and our country will return to a reasonable calm and maintain American courage, there will be no regimentation, because we will not go to war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 503, October 17, 1939.)

McKELLAR, KENNETH (Tennessee): "I am for the repeal of the embargo—

"Because I am for peace, first, last, and all the time, and believe that the policy of an embargo is at war with the policy of peace." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 653, October 20, 1939.)

"Again, Mr. President, I am for the repeal of the arms embargo because, instead of the repeal of the Embargo Act being a step toward war, as is so frequently contended, it is a step away from war. I believe that the safeguards in the joint resolution constitute many steps to keep us out of war. I think the embargo is the first step toward war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 654, October 20, 1939.)

"In conclusion, I wish to say that I shall never again vote to send our boys into any European war. I so voted in 1917, but I shall never again vote that way. I shall never vote for any war except when another nation attacks us; and a man or a nation that will not fight when attacked is not much of a man and not much of a nation."

"In the situation which confronts us in our dealing with other nations I wish to be fair and just to all, but I have but one thought, one purpose, one ambition. That is to serve and protect the best interests of America and Americans, and keep our blessed and beloved and splendid country out of war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 655, October 20, 1939.)

McNARY, CHARLES L. (Oregon) (speech on radio on October 15, inserted in RECORD):

"I now hear Members of Congress saying they will never vote for the involvement of this country in war. But what else can they do if the events of 1914-17 are repeated? The important thing is not to undo what we have done to prevent such a chain of events from beginning. The wise thing is to prevent the incidents which force on us the duty of making such a terrifying decision." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 307; Appendix, October 16, 1939.)

MURRAY, JAMES (Montana): "The people of this country have been completely disillusioned by the results of the last war; and no intelligent, patriotic citizen of this country today must fail to take the unalterable position that we at all hazards shall avoid intermeddling, taking sides, or becoming involved to any degree in the present conflict." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 906, October 26, 1939.)

"It is plain, however, that the repeal of the embargo and substitution of the cash-and-carry plan here proposed is the more likely to keep us out of war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 907, October 26, 1939.)

"Mr. President, if the American people in this war maintain their neutrality, not on a basis of taking sides, but on a just and legal basis—a basis which conforms to international law as we have known it for hundreds of years, no belligerent nation can justly take offense. If we do this I believe it is as certain as any event of such nature can be certain that sooner or later this country will be asked to exercise its good offices for peace. When that time comes it will not be difficult for the President of the United States to suggest the terms which establish justice between the warring countries, and, in fact, between all the nations of the Old World." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 911, October 26, 1939.)

OVERTON, JOHN H. (Louisiana): "Mr. President, I want no more European war, and I take it that no Senator of the United States

wishes another European war, because if we do enter into another European war it will be more disastrous than the last one. * * * It may saddle us with a home-made dictatorship. Whoever cherishes our civilization, whoever cherishes our institutions, our principles of liberty, of freedom of speech, of freedom of assembly, and all the glorious fundamental safeguards of American democracy, ought to shudder and look with horror upon the prospect of American involvement in another European war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 115, October 5, 1939.)

"I think it is idle for us to say that when that war does come it is going to be merely a paper war. * * *

"The cry will be 'We will fight the Germans where the Germans are, on the battlefields of Europe.' I do not want the United States to take that chance." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 119, October 5, 1939.)

RADCLIFFE, GEORGE L. (Maryland): "For instance, it has been suggested that we should refuse to sell to an aggressor, but should be willing to furnish arms and other supplies to a nation unjustly attacked. Determination as to who is right and who is wrong is not easy. Respective merits are sometimes mixed, and besides, the truth can often not be ascertained, if ever, until after a war is over, when records which were secret may be given publicity." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 936, October 26, 1939.)

REED, CLYDE M. (Kansas): "Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it is like every other war that has been fought in Europe in the past 200 years. It is a fight over power politics and boundaries.

"Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that if that is his opinion as to the basis of the present war in Europe, I am in entire agreement with him." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 280, October 11, 1939.)

REYNOLDS, ROBERT R. (North Carolina): "Much of our thinking in connection with the revision of the Neutrality Act has been based upon the assumption that the war aims of the belligerents are definite and clear. As a matter of fact, no one at this moment can definitely say what the war aims of either side are, or what either side intends to do when and if it wins the conflict." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 691, October 21, 1939.)

"I ask, is this a war to save democracy? Many competent students have grave doubt of it. * * * The fact is that about the only real democracy remaining in the world is right here in the United States * * * and if we should become involved in it, of course we would immediately have a dictatorship form of government." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 693, October 21, 1939.)

STEWART, TOM (Tennessee): "Regardless of any expressed viewpoint in this particular it seems to be the unanimous feeling of the Senate that this is one war America must stay out of." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 828, October 25, 1939.)

I think, therefore, it can be safely said that America is not going to enter this war regardless of its outcome, and I think that is the sane and sensible attitude to take. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 828, October 25, 1939.)

We have been advised by the leaders in the American Government for over a century that America should avoid foreign entanglements, and this sort of advice has always been good, but certainly never sounder advice than at this particular time. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 828, October 25, 1939.)

We are located in the Western Hemisphere 3,000 miles removed from the scene of this European conflict. Our chief interest is and should continue to be the welfare of our country, our people, and those who exist on this Hemisphere. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 829, October 25, 1939.)

THOMAS, ELBERT D. (Utah): "Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So far as I am concerned, I stand exactly where I think the pending joint resolution stands. I am opposed to giving credit to any country on earth for war purposes. Is that plain?"

"Mr. DOWNEY. Is that a declaration?"

"Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is my stand, and I think it is perfectly understandable. The United States of America should not extend credit; should not allow foreign nations to obtain credit; should not allow foreign nations to sell bonds in our country. In other words, the wars of foreign nations should be financed by foreign nations.

"Mr. DOWNEY. I am happy to have provoked that declaration which, I take it, is a commitment to the American people. If I understand the Senator from Utah—he now means—and if I am in error I should like to be corrected—that if conditions should develop under which the Allies still needed war supplies from us and could not pay for them, he would refuse to grant them credit with which to buy. Is that what I am to understand?"

"Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly. I stand upon the primary thesis that the United States should not finance the wars of other nations. We have quite a task of our own." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, pp. 167-168, October 6, 1939.)

"Those who have thought only of one thing, the lifting of the embargo, on the assumption that England and France are in need of airplanes, and that is the whole issue, fail to see through the act which we are proposing to pass as a unit. The proposed act can in no sense be deemed pro-German and anti-British. It can in no sense be deemed pro-British and anti-German." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 154, October 6, 1939.)

THOMAS, ELMER (Oklahoma): "I regret that history shows that our own beloved country has made contributions to some of the war scenes of the madmen of the Eastern Hemisphere.

"But we need not do that again. We are not obligated to either adjust or act as an arbiter in the adjustment of the partition fences in the backyards of either Europe or of any other nation on earth." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 199, October 9, 1939.)

TRUMAN, HARRY S. (Missouri): "The role of this great Republic is to save civilization. We must keep out of war. We must keep out of brawls, hates, and prejudices of that Old World mess, and to do it we must use the best brains and judgment of which we are capable.

"I honestly believe that the proposed amendment to the present law will come more nearly doing that (keeping us out of war) than if the present law is now amended." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, pp. 202-203, Appendix, October 9, 1939.)

TYDINGS, MILLARD E. (Maryland): "Yes. We are not without sin, and we should not cast the first stone. The war in Europe is not our war. It is not necessary for us to denounce Germany, or England, or France, or any other country. What is necessary for us to do is to mind our own business, sell as usual, and take whatever steps we deem proper for the protection of our own citizens. When we shall have done that, we shall do well not to meddle in the kind of war that is being fought 3,000 miles from home." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 905, October 26, 1939.)

VAN NUYS, FREDERICK (Indiana): "I want the American people listening in to know that there isn't a one of the majority of the Senate which will pass this bill, these amendments, very shortly, but what stands adamantly against the entrance of the United States of America into this or any other foreign war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 246, Appendix, October 11, 1939.)

WHITE, WALLACE H. (Maine): "This resolution rejects every principle of neutrality;

it flouts that international law to which the President appeals to us to return." * * * (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 977, October 27, 1939.)

"I am in agreement with the President that we are not going to war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 977, October 27, 1939.)

WAGNER, ROBERT F. (New York): "In my judgment, to treat some war materials differently from others would ultimately invite manipulation of our foreign trade with an eye to its effect on the fortunes of the war. That temptation for meddling and intervention can be avoided by a uniform cash-and-carry practice applicable without discrimination to all trade with all the warring nations." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 243, October 10, 1939.)

"If we propose to renew the claims we then made that complete freedom of the seas in trading with belligerents is among 'the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people,' then we should make no change in the Neutrality Act. But to permit that history to repeat itself is to generate the gravest menace to our national interest inherent in the European war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 241, October 10, 1939.)

"There are not likely to be any great war purchases in this country. England has determined, contrary to its position in the last war, that its first purchases will be made in its dominions. * * * It has estimated that England has, including her dominions and including some credits in South America, over \$10,000,000,000 available with which to purchase war materials and other necessary articles in this country to prosecute the war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 920, October 26, 1939.)

"WILEY, ALEXANDER (Wisconsin): Our domestic problems are far more important to America than Europe's war. Let our newspapers, radio stations, and motion pictures concentrate on putting the emphasis of American attention back where it belongs—on America." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 712, October 23, 1939.)

"The political leadership of America, both legislative and executive, can give more time to the consideration of Washington's advice—no entangling alliances—remembering that financial and economic alliances may be as dangerous to peace as political alliances." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 85, p. 712, October 23, 1939.)

And on March 7, 1941, Senator GEORGE in Senate, page 1957, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said: "I know that there are some who take the extreme view that we may go with contraband into a country at war, assuming all the risks; but so long as we have a public policy, declared in our neutrality act, to the contrary, it does not seem to me that the President would think of asserting such a power as that. I took great consolation from his positive statement, made after the introduction of the pending bill, that he would not think of using convoys, that the use of convoys would mean war."

Mr. TOBEY. I need not review the piecemeal emasculation of our neutrality legislation by an Administration which sought to justify its every step in that direction by the claim that it was motivated by a desire to keep America out of war. To those of us who objected and claimed that those gradual changes and eliminations constituted definite steps toward war, were hurled epithets of "alarmists!" and "shortsighted politicians!" While parading in the guise of peace-minded statesmen, Administration leaders and spokesmen embarked upon the greatest crusade of mass deceptions and intrigue that any nation has ever experienced. Their words were of peace, but their every action involved war.

One of the first acts of the President was to rid himself of advisers who adhered to the traditional policy of non-interference in the affairs of Europe. Then he surrounded himself with a clique of policymakers, not chosen because of their ability for the tasks assigned to them but because of their professed adherence to a philosophy of interventionism.

Years from now people will wonder how those individuals succeeded in obtaining confirmation by the Congress at a time when the majority of the Members of the Senate and of the House professed their allegiance to peace. The answer is that, like the President, they were skilled in using words to conceal their real thoughts, rather than to express them.

When Frank Knox was seeking confirmation as Secretary of the Navy before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, the following colloquy took place:

Senator HOLT. If they (our former Allies in Europe) need men in the United States to man those mechanized units, would you favor that?

Colonel KNOX. If what?

Senator HOLT. If they need our men.

Colonel KNOX. No; certainly.

Senator HOLT. Under no circumstances?

Colonel KNOX. No.

Senator HOLT. You would not favor sending any of our boys to Europe under any circumstances in the present crisis?

Colonel KNOX. That is right.

Senator HOLT. Even if the vital interests of the United States can best be served by sending our boys over there?

Colonel KNOX. Let me say this again, so there will be no doubt about it. My position has consistently been from the first that we ought to aid them in a moral and economic way, never in manpower.

Senator HOLT. If the moral and economic way would not be sufficient, for them to win, would you feel that we should go the rest of the way?

Colonel KNOX. No.

Senator HOLT. You do not?

Colonel KNOX. No.

Senator HOLT. Do you think it should collapse?

Colonel KNOX. I hope not.

When Secretary Knox was called to testify on the lend-lease bill before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] asked: "But we can perhaps convoy ships while we are neutral?" Mr. Knox replied, "No; in my judgment that would be an act of war." (P. 185, House hearings on H. R. 1776.)

Mr. Knox stated very definitely that he would not favor sending our troops abroad even if that policy meant collapse for Great Britain in this war. On the strength of his testimony before the committee when he was up for confirmation, I, for one, did not hesitate to vote for his confirmation in the belief that he would do all in his power to keep the United States at peace.

Secretary Stimson was equally insistent in stressing his desire to keep this country out of war, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House to testify on the lend-lease bill. He then said:

I am speaking with all seriousness because I have no more desire to have this country

get into war than you have. I think that it (the lend-lease bill) would tend in the direction of the greatest safety of this country, and a greater prevention of the danger of war. I think that is all I need to say (p. 118).

That was all he needed to say to lull into a false sense of security the countless millions that relied on his sincerity in announcing his opposition to war.

The high peak of insincerity and mass deception, however, was reached in the last Presidential campaign. One year ago, the American people throughout the country went to the polls with promises of peace still ringing in their ears. Both major parties had adopted strong and unequivocal peace planks. For weeks and months, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie had been competing with each other in making more and more vigorous promises, more and more reassuring promises, that the American people would not be driven into the European war. Mr. Roosevelt repeatedly pledged this in unmistakable terms. Here are some of his campaign promises. At Philadelphia, on October 23, 1940, the President said:

We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

On October 28, 1940, at New York City, the President said:

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps, we made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right? We made it clear that American investors who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

And at Boston, on October 30, 1940, the President said:

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again; your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. Yes; the purpose of our defense is defense.

Again, at Cleveland, on November 2, 1940, as the campaign drew to a close, the President said:

We know that we are determined to defend our country, and with our neighbors to defend this hemisphere. We are strong in our defense. * * *

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war.

And on December 7, 1940, the President said:

Your President says this, the Nation is not going to war.

In a voice vibrant with emotional appeal, and with a ring of sincerity designed to win votes, Mr. Willkie time and time again promised to do all in his power to

keep America out of war. Here are a few choice excerpts from his campaign oratory. At Cumberland, Md., on October 30, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

In protecting America, the maintenance of peace in the Western Hemisphere will be my objective. * * *

The interests of the United States would have been better served if the third-term candidate had been outspokenly for peace and nonparticipation (earlier) instead of waiting to pledge it in an election.

At Chicago, on October 22, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

One difference (between my foreign policy and that of the New Deal) is my determination to stay out of war. I have a real fear that this administration is heading for war, and I am against our going to war and will do all I can to avoid it.

At St. Louis, on October 17, 1940:

We do not want to send our boys over there again. We cannot and we must not undertake to maintain by force of arms the peace of Europe.

At Buffalo, on October 15, 1940:

I favor aid to Britain "short of war," and I mean "short of war."

And again, at Cambridge, Mass., on October 11, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

We can have peace, but we must begin to preserve it. To begin with, we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's wars. Our boys shall stay out of Europe. None of us is so simple as to think that Hitler is planning this moment to send an expeditionary force across the Atlantic. He is aware that if we made democracy strong here his own system of blood and tyranny cannot survive forever.

In addition, Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, speaking to the Brooklyn Republican Club, when the Willkie nomination boom was climaxing, said:

I want to repeat what I have said on several previous occasions, that despite our wholehearted sympathy for the Allied cause we must stay out of the war. In the stress of these times, when our hearts are confused with emotion, we must keep our heads clear. We do not intend to send men from the shores of this continent to fight in any war. That is not mere selfishness on our part; we shall not serve the cause of democracy and human freedom by becoming involved in the present war; we shall serve that cause only by keeping out of the war. I believe in national defense, not as a step toward war, but as a protection against it. It is the duty of the President of the United States to recognize the determination of the people to stay out of war and to do nothing by word or deed that will undermine that determination. No man has the right to use the great powers of the President to lead the people, indirectly, into war; only the people through their elected Representatives can make that awful decision, and there is no question as to their decision.

After that long record of repeated promises to keep America out of war, echoed and reechoed by the President, his Cabinet members, his spokesmen in the Congress, his opponent in the last Presidential campaign, and reflected in popular opinion as proven consistently by the various polls taken in this country, which show that at least 80 percent of the people still adhere to a policy of nonintervention, would it not be logical to assume that in a country reputedly free of executive despotism as ours is still supposed to be all advocacy of our participation in war should be practically

unheard of? But what is the situation today? War fever is at an all-time high. American blood has been spilled. Bold interventionists are crying out for an immediate declaration of war. The majority of the Members of Congress are swayed. They seem to be shaken in their former loudly expressed convictions. The President has asked for the immediate repeal of the provision banning the arming of merchant ships and has indicated a desire for prompt repeal of the provisions banning our ships from combat zones. The people of this country are confused—torn between a desire to avenge the deaths of their fellow countrymen and the desire to be fair in placing the blame squarely where it belongs. In other words, once more we have been visited with all the evils which precipitated us into the last World War, and the imminence of a more ghastly blood bath than that of 1917 turns our very stomachs.

What has come to pass that has changed the picture so completely in the last 2 years? Were our neutrality laws inherently defective? Could it be true that 100,000,000 Americans have been so utterly mistaken? Has our country's Territories, possessions, or sovereignty been attacked? Has something arisen that had not been foreseen by our statesmen and our fellow countrymen? The answer to all of those questions is an emphatic "No." Our neutrality laws were not inherently defective. The fact is that the administration has never given them a fair chance of success. They have not even been tried.

Those few provisions that did not lend themselves to a none-too-conspicuous evasion have produced excellent results. For instance, to this day it is still true that not one American life has been lost on a merchantman of the United States not carrying contraband articles of war. What then is the reason for this war hysteria?

Any fair-minded person would readily admit that the remote causes of it all is the plain fact that President Roosevelt and his sympathizers never were neutral, never intended to live either up to the letter or the spirit of our neutrality laws, and never intended to have this country play the game fairly and squarely.

They started giving signs of their contempt for our laws from the very beginning of this conflict. First, they asked for the repeal of the arms embargo. Then they offered to substitute a cash-and-carry provision which plainly discriminated in favor of one belligerent. The Johnson amendment, which restricted loans to belligerents under certain circumstances, then became the object of their scorn. The lend-lease program, of course, later made that provision inoperative. The lend-lease law bound us hand and foot to Great Britain's war effort. Thus, piece by piece our neutrality legislation was emasculated and, by a queer anomaly, always under the pretext that such changes would tend to keep us out of war, and to save American lives.

At least the administration went through the formality of submitting those issues to the Congress, although their

passage was assured in a body that has been known to be for 9 years a rubber stamp, except for a few notable instances like the attempt of the President to pack the Supreme Court, which so aroused the feelings of the American people. However, the President did not stop at that. When he deemed best not to consult Congress, he went ahead and did things his way, trusting to a benevolent clique of friends in Congress to legitimize later his unlawful acts. The transfer of 50 destroyers to England is but one example.

Once assured of 4 more years in the White House, Franklin Roosevelt's boldness knew no bounds. He and his Cabinet members and administration spokesmen began to speak of our alleged duty to build a bridge of ships across the ocean and of our alleged duty to insure delivery of war supplies we produced and made available to Britain. Thus they took, one after the other, the exact steps that we noninterventionists had, 2 years before, predicted they would take.

Reports started circulating that the administration was conveying or about to convey lend-lease materials. At that time I introduced an anticonvoy amendment in the Senate. Members of Congress started acquainting the people with the facts. Thousands upon thousands of letters protesting such steps poured into the Executive Mansion and into the offices of Members of Congress. The administration realized it was treading dangerous ground, and denials of this policy were made by the President, by the Secretary of the Navy, and by Senator BARKLEY here in the Senate. Then the administration complained because the people, it said, did not understand the dangers confronting them.

Was that the end of our unneutral conduct? No. The administration was bound to have its way despite the will of the people. Evading the Neutrality Act was not a novel experiment. Had not the administration transferred American-owned ships to the flag of the Republic of Panama since the war began and had not the United States armed at least some of its ships in violation of the intent of the Neutrality Act?

The naval patrol in the Atlantic offered a somewhat less satisfactory but potent means of involvement. Its scope was extended. Orders were given to not only report to our Navy the activities of Axis ships and submarines but to warn the ships of Great Britain of the location of their enemies. Thus a serious unneutral act was committed without the approval of the representatives of the people.

Still, incidents were not developing rapidly enough for our war-minded leaders. The President, in April of this year, canceled the Red Sea as a combat area and thus set the stage for the sinking of American-owned ships.

In July of this year the President usurped more authority and ordered our troops to occupy Iceland, thereby placing our ships in belligerent waters and violating the spirit of the Neutrality Act. The attacks on our ships that followed this action had been predicted by noninterventionists and were nothing but the logical result of such meddling tactics.

The occupation of Iceland was allegedly done to protect the United States, although Iceland is about 2,500 miles from this country and only 500 miles from the coast of England.

All the while the great protagonists of intervention kept beating the war drums. On May 7 of this year, at a freedom rally of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, Willkie called for "Less talk and more action" in effective aid to Britain, whether or not it meant convoys. "The struggle is already upon us," he said. "We cannot shut our eyes to it."

On October 18, last month, Willkie said that the United States "must abandon hope for peace."

On May 7 of this year Secretary Knox made this startling statement:

All the great resources of this Nation, including manpower, are committed to one supreme purpose—to see that British sea power shall not be destroyed.

Who made such a commitment? Certainly not the Congress. Did Roosevelt usurp the authority to do this in conversations with King George in the White House or with Prime Minister Churchill at their meeting on the high seas? Historians will probably furnish us with the answer to that when it will no longer be time for us to benefit by that knowledge.

Was that the reason for the President's precedent-shattering "shoot first" orders to the Navy on September 11?

We are all acquainted with the recent tragic results of the administration's foreign policy. American blood has been spilled because of the administration's meddling interference and disregard of this country's solemn duty as a neutral. All this had been predicted by noninterventionists. Two well-known columnists, Mr. Alsop and Mr. Kintner, one of whom is a cousin of Franklin Roosevelt and both of whom have received appointments in the United States Navy, stated on June 4 in their syndicated column that the President and the men around him hoped that the Atlantic patrol would result in an incident which can be used as an excuse for taking this country into war.

It is in this unwholesome atmosphere of hysteria and deceit that the administration again comes to this Congress for permission to arm merchant ships and to send our vessels into the war zones. It would seem that the recent loss of lives would awaken them from their mental lethargy and make them realize that no good will come from further emasculation of our neutrality law. That would be so if they were genuinely searching for peace. The fact is, however, that they are hell-bent on war.

I have already quoted at length from the remarks of various administration spokesmen who demonstrated with compelling logic back in 1939 how forbidding our ships to enter the war zones would tend to keep us out of war. Not one single meritorious argument has been advanced to disprove the logic of that theory. Whatever incidents have occurred to date have been caused by the administration's palpable disregard of that very policy.

Those who claim that it is necessary to arm our merchant ships to enable

them to defend themselves against submarine attacks cannot point to one single instance wherein an armed merchantman successfully protected itself against attack by a submarine by resort to its arms. The facts are, to the contrary, that such arming of neutral merchantmen invites attack and deprives the neutral ship of its right under the international laws to be allowed to proceed unmolested, providing it is not attempting to break an effective blockade or to carry contraband of war.

In view of the administration's war-mongering record and reputation for insincerity, is it not more logical to assume that the administration is seeking nothing but further incidents to fire the fury and hatreds of the American people and thus to put them in such a mood that they will clamor for war?

Mr. President, the issues before us are not limited to the immediate arming of merchantmen nor to the repeal of the war zones. They are much more far-reaching than that. We have before us the fundamental issue of war or no war, and let us make no mistake about that. That is one mistake that too many of the Members of this Congress have made in believing implicitly the Chief Executive's reassurances that this and that change in our neutrality legislation was designed for peace.

In the present debate this fundamental issue of war or no war, although ably camouflaged, came to the fore in the arguments of the various proponents of the present resolution when they shouted for "freedom of the seas" and echoed Roosevelt's fiery, picturesque, but inaccurate words about the "pirates of the seas." Of all the administration's speakers, I believe that the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] made the most thought-stirring address.

That able Senator who in 1939 said:

We are not going to get into this war; it is a European war; it is not our war * * * if we were to get into it I should think we were the greatest pack of fools history ever recorded. (Vol. 35, pp. 245-246, October 10, 1939.)

Today, while still claiming that he is "not making an argument for war" advocates the arming of our merchantmen and says:

Now hear me Senators a moment. The seas are not ours, but the rights on the seas are ours, and the seas are as much ours as they are anyone else's. It is not a no-man's land. It is a part of the duty, it is of the essence of the mission of the American Republic to restore those rights and to re-establish the reign of law on the high seas of the world.

Shall we run from this duty? If it is necessary to shoot, let us shoot.

Those are high-sounding phrases, but they ignore altogether the status of war and the rights of both belligerents and neutrals on the high seas.

The Senator from North Carolina discussed the sinkings of the ships flying the Panamanian flag and also of the *Robin Moor*, the *Lehigh*, and the *Sessa*. Other Senators discussed the torpedoing of the *Greer* and the sinking of the *Kearny*. A number of the Senators applied to those sinkings the epithets of unjustifiable and

to the Germans those of pirates and assassins. It is easy to call names and sometimes quite soothing to one's feelings and temperament, but the calling of names adds nothing to the understanding of the subject and often creates prejudice and bias that becloud the real issues.

Let us turn for a moment to the consideration of a few elementary principles of international law that often seem to go unnoticed in this debate.

I will not quote authorities for every principle I discuss, but I refer you to any well-known authority on international law to find corroboration of the accuracy of my statements. Among the most helpful is Oppenheim, especially in his second volume on international law wherein the subject of war is developed. Oppenheim was an outstanding British authority on international law, having taught that subject in the University of Cambridge for many years. Another well-known work is Moore's Digest on International Law, in eight volumes.

International law is a law for the conduct of nations grounded on the general assent of the nations of the world. For instance, when this country, after the Revolutionary War, became accepted as a nation, it was bound, along with other nations of the world, by the rules of international law in effect at that time. This Nation cannot withdraw from its obligations under international law by warning other nations that it intends to do so. In other words, international law is superior to the law of any individual nation. Whenever general assent, not necessarily unanimous assent, of nations exists on a rule or usage, all the nations of the world are bound thereby regardless of whether a particular nation has assented to that rule. International law differs from national law in that the former has no superior legislative body and no judiciary. It is simply grounded on general assent of the nations and it is applied by prize courts, domestic courts, and international tribunals.

Regardless of how loudly we proclaim to the world that we are going to treat the Germans as pirates and that we will carry contraband articles of war wherever we want, we cannot thereby change international law on those subjects nor can we make right by domestic legislation what international law holds to be wrong.

Naturally, one nation can limit its own rights under international law by treaties with other nations or by the enactment of domestic laws. That is what we did in the period of 1935-39, by imposing upon ourselves a more rigid neutrality than the law of nations compelled us to abide by. However, living up to our own domestic laws or discarding them is our own business alone and not a matter of concern for other nations. Living up to treaty obligations, however, is a matter of concern for all the signatories of the particular treaty involved.

Although we are free to limit our rights under international law by the enactment of domestic laws, we cannot increase our rights under international law in the same manner. This was well expressed by Mr. Justice Strong, speaking

for the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *Scotia* (14 Wall. 170) in which he said:

Undoubtedly, no single nation can change the law of the sea. That law is of universal obligation and no statute of one or two nations can create obligations for the world.

What were our obligations and rights as a neutral under international law?

Secretary Stimson has been quoted in the press as making the ridiculous statement that the law of neutrality did not mean you had to be impartial. Quite to the contrary, the fact is that international law makes impartiality the first duty of a neutral; impartiality is the cardinal rule of neutrality. The unanimous view on this subject is that so well expressed by Oppenheim in volume 2 of his great work on international law, on pages 422 and 423. He writes as follows:

Impartiality excludes such assistance and succor to one of the belligerents as is detrimental to the other and, further such injuries to one of the belligerents as benefit the other and * * * it includes active measures on the part of a neutral for the purpose of preventing belligerents from making use of neutral territories and neutral resources for their military and naval purposes and of preventing either of them from interfering with his legitimate intercourse with the other. But all this does not exhaust the contents of the duty of impartiality.

For according to the present strict conception of neutrality, the duty of impartiality excludes in addition all facilities whatever for military and naval operations of the belligerents even if granted to both belligerents alike. * * * The duty of impartiality today comprises abstention from any active or passive cooperation with belligerents.

Impartiality means legally that you must live up to such laws as there are as to a neutral country's actions in time of war.

A proclamation of neutrality is usually issued by the head of a neutral government at the beginning of hostilities. President Roosevelt did that at the beginning of the recent European war.

Does that mean that our merchant ships, under international law, could not carry guns, ammunition, and what-not to both belligerents, or even exclusively to Great Britain and the democracies, and could not refuse point blank to sell them to the Axis partners? Decidedly not. A neutral nation may allow its citizens to carry on trade in as partial a manner as they wish, and international law simply requires that the government itself of a neutral nation take no part in the discrimination. Under that rule our merchantmen could have supplied Great Britain and the democracies with all the materials they needed. But when our Government itself became partial, noticeably, with the passage of the lend-lease bill making materials available exclusively to the so-called democracies, the Government definitely went into the business itself, definitely took sides in the conflict and gave Germany the immediate right, under international law, to declare war on us.

Ever since the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, certainly, every cargo of war materials sent officially by this Government and destined for one of the bel-

ligerents, represents a gross violation of international law, every one of these violations constituted a just cause for war against us on the part of Germany.

As long as we limit ourselves to repealing those parts of our neutrality legislation which made us more neutral than the law of nations required us to be, we were exercising an absolute right under international law.

For instance, when we repealed the arms embargo, many of us were convinced that that was an unwise step and that it would tend to lead us into war, in the light of what happened in the last World War. We noninterventionists predicted that such repeal would have that effect; and no one can deny, in the light of recent developments, that it has led us to the very brink of war. However, under international law, we had a right to permit our citizens to ship whatever they wanted to Europe.

What, then, are the rights of these merchantmen in time of war? This leads us to the consideration of the question of, What is freedom of the seas? Administration leaders and spokesmen have been speaking eloquently of our duty to resume our traditional policy of insisting on the freedom of the seas. What is our traditional policy? It is simply the rule of international law on the matter, and, if it were not, it would be of no effect whatever.

Freedom of the seas is the right of the ships of neutral nations to sail the seas subject, in time of war, to the right of belligerents to visit and search those ships and to seize the same in case the ship is carrying contraband or attempting to break an effective blockade.

Freedom of the seas never meant that a neutral government could load its ships with contraband and insist on an alleged right to pilot them unmolested through war zones to deliver their cargo to one of the belligerents.

When privately owned merchantmen carry contraband they do so at their own risk. Either belligerent has a right to order it to heave to and to examine its cargo. If the cargo is contraband or there is probable cause to believe that it is, the belligerent has the undoubted right to take that ship to one of the belligerent's ports or to a port of an ally of that belligerent for an adjudication before a prize court. If the cargo is found by that court to be contraband, the belligerent has the undoubted right to confiscate it and the ship.

It is true that no complete list of contraband was ever drawn up and given assent to by the nations of the world, but some articles are recognized by international law to be absolute contraband. Among those are arms, equipment for soldiers or battleships, warships, bombers, pursuit planes, uniforms for soldiers, and any other goods directly helpful to a belligerent in prosecuting the war with greater vigor.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of the *Peterhoff* (5 Wall 28), had this to say about contraband:

The classification of goods as contraband or not contraband has much perplexed text-writers and jurists. A strictly accurate and

strictly satisfactory classification is perhaps impracticable; but that which is best supported by American and English decisions may be said to divide all merchandise into three classes. Of these classes, the first consists of articles manufactured and primarily and ordinarily used for military purposes in time of war. The second, of articles which may be used and are used for purposes of war or peace, according to circumstances, and the third, of articles exclusively used for peaceful purposes.

Merchandise of the first class destined to a belligerent country or places occupied by the army or navy of the belligerent, is always contraband; merchandise of the second class is contraband only when actually destined to the military or naval use of a belligerent; while merchandise of the third class is not contraband at all, though liable to seizure and condemnation for violation of blockade or seizure. * * * The trade of neutrals with belligerents in articles not contraband is absolutely free unless interrupted by blockade; the conveyance by neutrals to belligerents of contraband articles is always unlawful, and such articles may always be seized during transit by sea.

In that case artillery harness, men's army bluchers, artillery boots, and Government regulation gray blankets were held to come fairly under the description of goods primarily and ordinarily used for military purposes in time of war.

What happens to a merchantman that refuses to halt when a belligerent attempts to exercise the right of visit and search? The belligerent can fire upon it and even sink it if necessary to prevent its escape, and international law condones that action. Furthermore, those belligerent rights may be exercised anywhere on the high seas except in a neutral nation's territorial waters. However, those territorial waters in international law are the 3-mile limit and not an area proclaimed by a so-called neutral to extend hundreds of miles at sea.

Those are our traditional views of the freedom of the seas in wartime, and regardless of how high sounding the pronouncements of administration leaders may seem, when they speak of our right to get essential war materials to England or to the democracies they are not expounding our traditional policy of freedom of the seas but calling for action that will brand this Nation, along with Nazi Germany, as one of the greatest violators of international law of all times.

Oh, I hold no brief for Hitler. I do regard Nazi Germany as one of the greatest violators of international law of all times. The real present-day break-down in the observance of international law began when Germany and Russia and Italy started sending troops to Spain to take part in the recent Spanish revolution without a declaration of war. Those were grave violations of their obligation as neutrals.

I have no doubt as to who is the aggressor in the present European war. When Hitler started his war with the avowed aim of redressing the evils contained in the Versailles Treaty he did not announce a just cause for war under international law. After all, Germany had signed that treaty and was bound to its observance. A war seeking redress of the evils of the Versailles Treaty is a policy war and not a war for a just cause under international law.

When Hitler invaded Belgium and other countries he started an unjust war against those countries and he gave those countries a just cause for war. In fact, they did not have to wait for an invasion; they could have taken offensive action long before, when there existed a real threat or likelihood of invasion. They could then have declared war, and that would have been a just war. International law recognizes as a just cause for war the defense of a nation's territory against invasion, or a real existing threat thereof. International law also recognizes as a just cause for war a serious attack on a nation's sovereignty, as when England boarded our ships to recapture British seamen at the inception of the War of 1812.

Germany has no right to draw a ring around Iceland, for instance, and announce it will sink every ship that enters that zone, because it is plain that Germany has not established an effective blockade of that area. If we were in the exercise of our rights under international law, and our merchantmen were sunk in such a zone, and that was not the result of accident but a consistent policy on the part of Germany, I would advocate a declaration of war against Germany immediately. Our sovereignty would then be attacked and we would have a just cause for war. Furthermore, it is not the traditional American policy to do any pussyfooting on the matter of freedom of the seas.

However, when our warships are attacked, torpedoed, and sunk by Germany while they are engaged in unneutral conduct while they are carrying contraband of war to belligerents or conveying ships that are engaged in such practices, or working in conjunction with a belligerent fleet by announcing the presence of Axis ships in the vicinity, I cannot honestly and in good conscience approve of a declaration of war. We are then giving Germany a just cause for attack and we cannot complain.

We cannot declare war because of the fact that ships flying the Panamanian flag are sunk, because we have no ground for complaint under international law. A ship gets its nationality from its flag and registry. We have no legal right to protest the sinking of a ship not of our registry.

We cannot protest the sinking of the *Steel Seafarer* because the result of the hearings discloses that she was accompanied by two other ships that were armed, and that they were shooting at the airplanes which sank the *Steel Seafarer*. As Senator TART has pointed out:

She was grouped with a number of other armed ships in such a way that it certainly would be somewhat difficult for any hostile ship to determine which one it was shooting at.

Even the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] agreed on this when he said:

I will agree with the Senator that if a ship is in an armed convoy it is regarded as part of the convoy and is just as subject to be shot down as one of the warships.

The *Robin Moor* and the *Lehigh* presented a different situation. Germany's acts cannot be justified on the information that we have on those cases.

Turning passengers out in open boats a thousand miles from land is not countenanced by international law. It is inhuman. A belligerent may sink a ship which resists visit and search or seizure, or it can sink a ship that it has lawfully seized when it is impossible to take it into port for an adjudication, because, for instance, the presence of enemy ships in the vicinity makes it perilous to do so; but in such cases the belligerent has to make some provision for the safety of the crew and passengers. However, let me point out again that we have not all the facts before us. Those passengers were, in fact, picked up, and it may well be that the presence of enemy ships made it impossible to provide for the safety of passengers, and that Germany in that case relied on the likelihood that they would soon be picked up by those enemy ships.

Furthermore, it ill behooves us to complain of illegal acts, if such they were, when they were preceded by a whole series of unneutral acts, of serious violations of international law on our part. The principle of "Let him who is without sin among you cast the first stone" applies to this situation.

Can we with very good grace say "We will treat the Germans as pirates for having turned out in open boats, miles from shore, the passengers on two of our ships" when our President has given orders to our Navy to sink on sight any Axis ship it may encounter on the high seas? That is the greatest violation of international law that has yet been met with in modern times, to say nothing of its being an undoubted violation of the Constitution and a further step toward the development of a government of men and not of laws in this country.

Mr. President, in the last 2 weeks, in a public address delivered by one of the leaders of the administration, a statement was made which has passed notice and which has not been commented upon during this debate. I hold no vindictiveness in my heart toward any man, but in any event this statement made by Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox on Navy Day is so reprehensible that it might well be called exhibit A in incongruities and constitutional misunderstandings. Mr. Frank Knox, speaking on Navy Day, made this statement. Hear ye! Hear ye, Senators! Frank Knox said:

We must make the laws conform to our actions.

Before God, Senators, what have we come to in this country? "We must make the laws conform to our actions." I was brought up in the New England way, in the American way. I had supposed that it was the function of men in public life, charged with the responsibility under solemn oath to preserve and protect and defend the Constitution, to make their actions conform to the laws—not the 1941 Knox version—go ahead and do things, embroil the country in war by acts of war, and then make the laws conform to their actions. By that token, if that argument is sound, the Governor of a State can spend \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000, or any sum he wants to, and then say to the legislature, "Gentlemen,

it is incumbent upon you to make the laws conform to my actions."

Mr. President, if we want any further evidence that this Nation is a totalitarian state, there it is. That is Hitler's method. No man in this Nation, in my judgment, ever made a statement so at variance with the oath he took to the Constitution and so against common sense and parliamentary procedure as to say to an audience on Navy Day, "We must make the laws conform to our actions."

God save this country if that doctrine permeates public life in America. It is time for someone to hold out the red light of warning of disaster and for us to stop, look, and listen when a man in public life gives utterance to such words or echoes such sentiments in his heart.

The President and his supporters have been repeating, time and time again, that the Germans are "pirates of the seas." The President has tried to justify his "shoot first" orders on the ground that past Presidents have issued orders to our fleet to track down and destroy pirates. That is pure sophistry and would be a joke if its effect were not so tragic. Pirates are robbers on the high seas, not commissioned by any sovereign. International law recognizes the right of a nation to destroy pirates, but no one knowing the least bit about international law would ever contend that ships commissioned by the German Government and engaged in warfare are guilty of piracy.

And now the President comes to us for permission to arm our merchant ships and to allow our ships to enter the war zones. Those ships will be carrying contraband articles of war sent officially by this Government to one of the belligerents. They will be subject to seizure. Under the "shoot first" orders they will resist seizure. The fact that they are armed and under orders to "shoot first" will give Germany an absolute right, under international law, to sink them on sight and without trace. No one in his right mind can fail to foresee that some of those ships will be sunk, that more American blood will be spilled, and that this is nothing but undeclared war. Article I of Convention III of the Second Hague Conference, held in 1907, makes it unlawful to commence hostilities without a previous and unequivocal warning, which may take the form either of a declaration of war stating why the power concerned has recourse to arms, or of an ultimatum with a conditional declaration of war. Let us face the issues in the traditional American way. Let us put a halt to this war that the President has declared, or let us declare war in the only way authorized by the Constitution by vote of the Congress.

Those who are willing to have our Navy clear the seas of Axis ships should not hesitate to demonstrate the courage of their convictions and vote for a declaration of war. They would thereby be rendering this country a good service, because such a declaration would legalize, under international law, the hostile acts they are about to authorize. That is why I will favor having the issue of war or no war voted on in the Congress at this time.

I will vote against such a declaration of war because I do not believe we have a just cause for war. We all can see that to this very hour our territory has not been invaded. Furthermore, I do not believe that there exists the slightest threat of a successful invasion of this country. I do not believe in the imaginary invasion of this hemisphere that has been predicted as the very next step in Hitler's conquest of the world.

I do believe Hitler would like to conquer this country, but I have never heard of one respected authority on war concede that such is possible. If we continue building up our national defense, no conqueror, no nation or group of nations would ever dare to attempt it, least of all Hitler who has built up so many hates in Europe that he will never be able to untangle the potential "fifth column" against him which exists throughout the continent should he live a thousand years. Lt. Col. Thomas R. Phillips, of the General Staff Corps of the United States Army, wrote recently in the *Army and Navy Journal*:

Even if the United States had no harbor defenses it would be impregnable to invasion. And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of an invading power. * * * The bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] recently quoted Admiral G. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, as stating that America is in no danger of invasion as long as it maintains strong air and naval forces.

I would not vote for a declaration of war on the ground that Germany would wage an economic war against us, because I do not believe Germany would successfully do that. No less an authority than Bernard Baruch has testified that even though Hitler should win a technical military victory in Europe, Germany and not the United States would be the loser of the economic campaign for world trade.

I would not vote for a declaration of war because our sovereignty has not been attacked and because we, at this time, not Germany, are the aggressor.

Oh, I know some of our armchair patriots will brand me as traitorous for claiming that we are waging an unjust war against Germany at this time. Let me tell you why the possibility of their doing that does not perturb me in the least.

Nearly 100 years ago a President of the United States got us into war by fraud. In his message to Congress in December 1847 he charged, as he had done when he began the war, that it had been started by Mexico, but a Member of the House of Representatives, newly arrived from the "sticks," gave the President the lie, charging on January 12, 1848, that his message was "from beginning to end the sheerest deception." This "hick" Member of the House of Representatives had already voted—January 3, 1848—for a resolution declaring that the war had been "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States," and in a later speech, dated February 15, 1848, he asked why the Constitution

vested in Congress exclusively the power to declare war, and replying to his own question: So no one man can plunge the country into war as kings have done. I urge you to read in the Congressional Globe how that Member of the House of Representatives cut through the sham of the President's message of December 1847. Of course, that Member of the House of Representatives did not escape vilification. Thus for instance in the Illinois State Register of March 10, 1848, we read of "his base, dastardly, and treasonable attack on President Polk," and "this Benedict Arnold of our district." However, 15 years went by and then what happened? The "hick" Congressman who in 1848 had denounced Polk, became President of the United States. He was Abraham Lincoln of Kentucky, today honored throughout this country as one of the greatest Presidents we ever had, and throughout the world as one of the preeminently honest men in the public life of our country.

I would not favor a declaration of war on the ground that we will spread the four freedoms throughout the world because that would be a policy war and not a war recognized as just under international law.

I would not favor a war against Germany on the ground that Hitler is persecuting minorities, much as I abhor such tactics, because again this would not be a juridically recognized just cause under international law. Furthermore, such persecutions contain the seed of their own destruction. A great author, writing on the persecutions of the first Christians by the Romans, and realizing the number of Christians increased despite the brutal slayings, exclaimed in awe that "Martyrdom is the seed of Christians." Furthermore, I wonder why the advocates of war on that ground were not heard to demand a declaration of war against Mexico when in the twenties Mexico resorted to mass persecutions of Christians, or against Russia, which for many years has tried to destroy the very idea of the existence of a Supreme Being in the hearts of its citizens, resorting to mass murders of Christians as a means.

I would not vote for a declaration of war, because I promised the people when I was elected, as most of you present here today did promise at one time, that I would not vote to send one of our boys to die on foreign fields and because I am more convinced than ever that the great majority of our people are still opposed to participation in this war.

I will not vote for a declaration of war, because I know that war is to be used as a remedy of last resort and that we have done nothing to iron out our difficulties by other means.

I will not vote for a declaration of war, because before doing so, the Nation should consider the likelihood of success and because I subscribe to the view expressed in the following editorial entitled "The Fear of Fear" from the July 1941 issue of the Catholic World:

* * * And now for my theory as to how we can defeat Hitler. It is not an epoch-making discovery. It will not revolutionize

warfare. Don't be disappointed, but it is really old stuff. Nor is it mine. It is General Grant's. It is Stonewall Jackson's. It was Meade's at Gettysburg. It was Napoleon's and Hannibal's and Julius Caesar's and Alexander's. Now of course it will come as an anticlimax. But here it is. Don't let the enemy choose the ground on which you will fight. Pick your own battlefield. Make him fight on the field of your choosing. When you choose, choose a place of advantage to yourself.

In the present circumstances, that is to say, barring a revolution in Germany, we cannot do victorious battle against Hitler in Europe. If we fight him on his ground, he may defeat us. If we make him fight us on our ground, we can destroy him. The moment Hitler turns his back on Europe and ventures overseas to the Americas, he seals his doom. He will leave behind him 110,000,000 rebellious people whom he has conquered. Add the disgruntled and the dissatisfied in Germany; add perhaps 50 percent, if not 75 percent, of the 40,000,000 in Italy, and you have 200,000,000 Europeans who will seize the chance to stick him in the back. Add, furthermore, Russia, and you have 375,000,000 malcontents. Russia may or may not be a hollow shell economically, but her 10,000,000 armed men, even if their armament be outmoded and their officers incompetent, will be a danger—once the Fuehrer's back is turned.

I will not vote for a declaration of war because I know that before doing so a nation should seek to determine whether the war will yield greater benefits than evils, and I cannot see that it will.

If those who are seeking to involve our Nation as a shooting participant in the European war are successful, what lies ahead of us? What price war? Tax burdens far greater than anyone has visualized. A debt unprecedented, so staggering in its magnitude as to make inevitable inflation, the decrease of savings, life insurance and annuities, the crippling of trust funds, educational and charitable institutions, and the repudiation of a large part of our national debt, a depression in industry and finance which will make the depression of 1931 and 1932 seem mild in comparison; the sacrifice of millions of lives of young American manhood and, what is even worse, a tragic harvest of mentally incapacitated men, brokenhearted mothers, fathers, and families.

We will lose our democratic way of life, and the liberties and freedoms vouchsafed us in this Constitution, while in their place there will arise some Fascist or Communist form of government.

What a heritage for our children. In the long years of aftermath of the hell of it all, those of us still living will turn back in retrospect to these days, and the youth of that day will turn and ask us why we permitted the warmongers of 1941 to push this Nation into the maelstrom of European intrigue and selfishness.

Let me close with a personal appeal to each of my colleagues. Whether you be Democrat or Republican, remember that each of the great parties assured the people of America when they sought their support a year ago that they were opposed to our participation in the war and would keep the Nation at peace.

Shall we repudiate that obligation today and thereby increase the number of

those throughout the land who cynically assert that political promises are made only to get votes, or shall we rise above all political or personal considerations, all blandishments, all hopes of favor or fear of disfavor, and by our refusal to adopt this amendment, the operations under which in my honest judgment will be pregnant with death, human misery, sadness, and disillusionment, give new courage and hope to the millions of men and women throughout our land who abhor war, and who trusted us to live up to our campaign promises?

Having in mind the disillusionment which has come to all of us in the aftermath of the war of 1917 and the human misery and losses that accrued therefrom, and as we visualize the chaos which is certain to result from our participation in all-out war, may each of us echo in his heart the prayer of Kipling:

Lord God of Hosts
Be with us yet
Lest we forget!
Lest we forget!

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it is not my intention to delay a final vote on the pending measure by explaining at length the views I entertain on neutrality legislation. I have been on record since the 24th day of August 1935, on that subject.

It will be recalled that in 1934 Mussolini decided that he wanted to make Ethiopia an Italian colony, and regardless of the protests of most of the nations of the world he sent his invading army into Ethiopia and by reason of the superior number of his trained soldiers and his better equipment he brought under his domination the people of Ethiopia. During the process of conquering Ethiopia there was much division among the countries who belonged to the League of Nations on the best course to be pursued by those who were not in sympathy with Mussolini's outrageous and unlawful treatment of another nation. The subject of neutrality or the part of the United States in the event a war or wars grew out of that situation became a subject of very great interest to the United States.

On August 20, 1935, Senate Joint Resolution 173 was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. That resolution provided for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during the war. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 79, part 13, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, August 20, 1935, page 13795.

On the following day the Senate passed that resolution. There was no ye-and-nay vote on its passage. Later the same resolution was slightly amended and passed by the House. On August 23,

1935, the resolution, as amended, was laid before the Senate. The late Senator Pittman, then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made the following brief statement:

Mr. President, I intend to move to concur in the House amendments. There is only one material change in them, and that is limiting the life and effect of the provision carrying an embargo against the shipment of arms to belligerent countries. The other amendments are immaterial.

The amendment referred to limited the life of the first section of the bill to the 29th day of February 1936.

On the adoption of the conference report in the Senate a yea-and-nay vote was taken on request of Senators NYE, VANDENBERG, and LA FOLLETTE. On Senator Pittman's motion to concur in the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 173 there were 79 yeas and 2 nays. The 2 nays were BANKHEAD and GERRY (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, pt. 13, p. 14434). The vote on the adoption of the conference report covered no material issue. The 2 votes cast against the conference report were cast as a result of opposition to the joint resolution.

During the brief discussion preceding the final vote, the present senior Senator from Texas, who is now happily chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, expressed views which in part covered my position; and while the Senator from Texas did not vote against the passage of the joint resolution, I am free to say that what he said on that occasion gave encouragement and support to my opposition to the legislation. I quote in part from the remarks made by the Senator from Texas on that occasion:

Mr. President, I shall not vote against the pending joint resolution. I shall support it, but I do so because it is temporary, and because it is at least a gesture in the interest and in behalf of peace. I do not believe the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Senate itself has had sufficient time for deliberation and proper consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I pray God that we may never have another war in which the United States will be involved. I do not believe that this joint resolution in and of itself will make any substantial contribution toward a realization of that hope. For myself, I think it unwise to announce the policy stated in section 1 of the joint resolution. It is a straight announcement by statutory law that the United States, in the event of war anywhere on this earth, will sell neither supplies nor ammunition to any nation, regardless of the issues involved, and regardless of all other considerations.

Under international law it is not an unneutral act for any nation to sell arms and ammunition and supplies to any nation at war. That is not an unneutral act. By this measure, in section 1, we are judging in advance every international clash or conflict which may occur anywhere on earth.

My own view is that section 1 of the joint resolution should provide that the President of the United States, who is charged under the Constitution with the conduct of our foreign relations, should have the power, in the event of a conflict, in his wisdom to place an embargo upon the shipment from this country of arms and ammunition and supplies. Then the United States would not entirely abdicate all of its international influence.

Is it an expression of neutrality to say to two warring nations, one of which has ambitions for territorial conquest, the other unprepared, the other weak, the other trying to pursue its own destiny—is it neutral to say to those nations, "We shall give arms to neither of you," thereby insuring the triumph of the prepared nation, the covetous nation, the ambitious nation, the nation which seeks by force of arms to impose its will on a weaker and defenseless nation?

Mr. President, that is not neutrality; that is a form of unneutrality. That is a form of declaration which announces that the United States will take the side of the strong and the powerful against the weak, the unprepared, and the defenseless. Why not leave that determination to the President of the United States when and if, in his conduct of our foreign relations, it becomes a sound American policy for him to take a position in a crisis of that kind?

The pending joint resolution of itself does not mean peace. I want real peace; I want the United States never to become involved in war; but the surest way to involve this country in war is to let the rest of the world believe that we will fight under no circumstances at all. China is a marvelous example of that sort of attitude.

That is the end of the quotation from the splendid argument made by the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in 1935, when we passed the first Neutrality Act.

Mr. President, I distinctly recall that when I voted against the measure, my then colleague, Senator Hugo Black, now Mr. Justice Black, was sitting with me in the Senate, and he expressed the view that I was making a mistake in opposing the neutrality legislation. Numerous speeches have been made during the pendency of this measure by very able Senators who have enlarged upon the arguments made by the Senator from Texas (Mr. CONNALLY), and who have added many other strong and effective reasons in opposition to the provisions of the present neutrality law. These speeches have further confirmed my view that the United States should have complete freedom of action to deal with conditions and circumstances as they may develop in the course of any war in which foreign nations may be involved. I have not changed in any way my views on the subject as expressed by my vote in 1935 and shall vote in favor of the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest. Of course, I intend to support the joint resolution by my vote. I have heard those of us who will support the joint resolution called several severe names. I have heard us called interventionists; I have heard us called warmongers. I now get some mail indicating that I am a murderer. These names, I find, do not seem to change votes.

I have been greatly impressed by the apparent sincerity and, as I believe, the actual sincerity of those who will vote just the opposite from myself. I am satisfied that they believe what they have said; and in the main I think most of us agree, because most of the arguments made by those who are intending to vote against the joint resolution are arguments against war in the abstract; and on that I think all of us can agree.

Of course, it has been rather bad on our nerves when they have pointed out to us the limping soldiers, and when we were told that our sons will come home crippled and maimed. Those things may be true; I do not know. I do not think they know. I do not think any human being knows what the outcome of this struggle may be.

I do believe, however, that there is some sincerity in America. I have not lost faith in the people who rule America. I have not lost faith in the President of the United States. I have not lost faith in the Secretary of State of the United States. I have not lost faith in our naval and our military leaders. I have listened to the testimony which has been given before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I have heard the arguments produced here. I still am willing to have faith in America.

The majority of the Members of the Senate—although not always being the same persons—but the majority of the Senate from time to time, changing in the identity of the votes, has passed the acts and the resolutions asked for by the administration. I believe that in so doing they have been sincere. I think that those of the opposition, those who oppose the views the majority hold, should at least concede to us who vote differently from them that we are not warmongers, that we are not in favor of war, that we are not entirely without information or capacity to think. It seems to me that, if we take the position that our friends take with reference to the President of the United States, they must say that either he is unfair or that he is naive, if they wish to put it that way, or that he is a traitor to the United States, or they must say he is foolish.

I believe that the President of the United States is sincere, and I do not class him as being without ability. His record, and the record of the American people, in their votes of confidence in him and his conduct, show that the American people have confidence in him; and it seems to me that to side-step the whole question before the American people, and simply to argue against war in the abstract, is not helping the American people to come to an intelligent conclusion as to the issues before them.

These are serious times, and these are serious issues; and the people of the United States are entitled to the best judgment and the best arguments which can be produced on these issues.

I do not think we should stand back and say that there should be no war, in any event, under any conditions. I presume that such an argument as that was used before the Revolutionary War. I presume that there were those who stood before the people of that time and said, "No; we are opposed to war."

Oh, you have such an advantage, gentlemen, when you just argue against war. No one is going to contradict you. But when you come to the question of principle or the great objectives which have led nations into war, then you come to something upon which there may be disagreement—honest, straightforward disagreements. There is a disagreement today as to whether American ships

should be armed, should have the right to be armed.

On that question a great deal of testimony was taken by the Foreign Relations Committee; and we were told by those who are specialists, those who know the situation, that while not many direct hits by merchantmen may be anticipated, the indirect effect of arming American ships would be to lessen the chances that would be taken by submarines and the chances that would be taken by airplanes in their attacks on the merchant marine; and those who have studied that subject believe it is something that should be done.

However, while I agree with those who are specialists, my position on the repeal of the various provisions of the Neutrality Act is based upon a different thought. While I am in favor of the repeal of the sixth paragraph, I am more in favor of the repeal of the second and third paragraphs. I hear Senators say that they do not think those paragraphs should be repealed. It seems to me that those who refuse to concede to American ships the right to go to the various ports of the world are taking the position which the President has said has operated against the interests of America in the past.

I call attention to the statement of the President in his address on September 21, 1939. On page 3 of that address he said, with reference to the conduct of the American Nation:

The single exception was the policy adopted by this Nation during the Napoleonic wars, when, seeking to avoid involvement, we acted for some years under the so-called Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous failure—first, because it brought our own Nation close to ruin; and, second, because it was the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars in our own War of 1812.

As this war has developed, with Great Britain fighting a defensive war, as she has, and placing her eastern front at the English Channel instead of in France and Belgium, it has resulted in Germany conquering the mainland of Europe; but Germany has not won the war, and will not win the war until she conquers the sea.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Delaware on the amendment has expired.

Mr. TUNNELL. I shall speak for 10 minutes on the joint resolution.

That is the position in which America finds itself at this time. It is aiding Great Britain in Great Britain's defense, and Great Britain's defense is now on the sea. The submarine has changed international law. It is true that in the agreement of London there was on the part of Germany an acceptance of international law as it had been known with reference to the submarine. Of course, that was when Hitler was not ready to go to war. Hitler now is in war and ready for war, and he does not observe the agreement of the German Nation. That agreement affects, and is bound to continue to affect, the struggle for the supremacy of the sea.

I am not among those who are willing to say to any foreign nation, "You may prescribe just where American ships may go. You may say to the people of the United States that into a body of water 1,600 miles in one direction and 1,500 miles in the other no American ships shall travel. Hitler, or any other temporary conqueror of the world, may say that not only shall a body of water 1,500 or 1,600 miles square be prohibited to American ships, but no part of the Atlantic Ocean shall be used by American ships."

If the pending joint resolution passes, it will be a question of whether or not the old rights—the rights which America has always claimed for the freedom of the seas—shall be maintained. If Hitler or any other European conqueror has a right to say that we shall not use the Atlantic, what is to prevent one of the nations of Asia from saying that we shall not use the Pacific? Then where shall American shipping go? Where will American shipping then be? Or will it be, as the President has said, driven from the ocean, and America practically ruined? Where is the future commerce of America to be if we may not use the seas?

I am more anxious to see paragraphs 2 and 3 repealed than to see paragraph 6 repealed. I think the shades of Paul Jones and of Farragut and of all those great commanders of the American Navy must be watching us today. I think they must wonder whether the old spirit of independence, the idea of America having the right to use the seas, has passed out from America. It seems to me that not only our commerce but our very self-respect is at stake.

I was glad when I heard the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] say that he voted against the Neutrality Act when it was originally passed. It seems to me that whether what we do at this time is a cause of war, or whether it is not, there must come a time when America may leave its own shores with its own shipping. There must come a time when America's stand on the sea will be maintained by America, even though it may result in what the President has described as shooting on the sea.

I am not of those who believe that this necessarily means sending an expeditionary force to the continent of Europe. I believe that this is a fight for the control of the seas. I am not in favor, as I now see the situation, of voting for an expeditionary force to go to the continent of Europe. I do not know whether conditions will ever arise when it would be advisable for America to take that position, but I do believe that the time has come when American shipping should be allowed to use the high seas. I believe there is too much at stake, not only for the present generation but the generations which are to come, when we think of the destruction of commerce, when we think of the absolute loss of control of the seas, that America will be pinned down to its own continent, unable to use the seas by which it is surrounded, both to the east and to the west, unable to use those seas for the purpose of carrying either our manufactured products or our

agricultural products to the nations of the world which may need those products.

Mr. President, it happens that at this time Great Britain must have our products. In the first instance, as I see it, if this act shall not be repealed Great Britain will stand a very good chance of not being able to compete with the great armies of Continental Europe. If it is determined by the gods of war that Great Britain shall be defeated entirely, if she shall be overrun, then with what nation will we trade, to what nation can we look for assistance in not only getting rid of our products from a commercial standpoint, but in maintaining ourselves as a free nation, and in maintaining the position to which America has always adhered, that the seas are free to the flag of the United States?

Mr. President, I shall vote with a good deal of satisfaction for the repeal of sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act as well as the remainder of the resolution.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, a few days ago I released to the press a statement of my feelings and position with respect to the pending joint resolution. At that time I stated:

In my opinion the security of our freedom can best be maintained by the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 of the neutrality law. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate acted wisely in broadening the scope of the resolution approved by the House.

In these perilous times the activity of our Navy cannot be confined to the wishes of a world dictator, and the lives of our sailors must be protected by the arming of our merchantmen.

I shall vote for the resolution and the recommendation of the Senate committee.

Although reluctant to take up the time of the Senate, I feel it incumbent upon me to amplify that statement and to preface my remarks by briefly recalling that it was just a year ago next week that the Nation was unfortunately deprived of the influence of one of Nevada's most illustrious statesmen—Key Pittman. It fell to the lot of the late Senator from Nevada to assist in forming the foreign policy of our Government. As an able and foresighted chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he was instrumental in steering through the Senate legislation which kept up with the times and the needs of our foreign affairs. It was because of his recognition of the fact that aid to Britain in the form of matériel is vital to American defense that he was active in the battle for elimination of the arms embargo. At that time he laid the cornerstone for a policy which must now be furthered by passage of the joint resolution before the Senate today.

In recent months our foreign policy has turned to even more definite terms. By a vote of Congress and with the approval of a large majority of the American people, we adopted and have pursued the policy of aid to Britain.

The crux of the question before us is how the repeal of these sections of the Neutrality Act will implement this national policy. In my opinion, this resolution before us is simply an elimination of the inconsistencies of the present situation resulting from the passage of the lend-lease bill and the vast appropri-

tions voted in order to perform under the lend-lease legislation. The bill before the Senate now materially improves the position of our Nation and follows our established policy of all-out aid to Britain, stripped of the limitations now existing under the law.

I think it not impossible for us to agree on this one conclusion, that is, as to the aims and ambitions of world domination by the German dictator, Adolf Hitler. Since this is true, and we have adopted the policy of aid in thwarting this ambition by applying matériel, it is only reasonable that we have more or less chosen up sides in this conflict. I have never been a follower of or a convert to the theory that any nation could successfully invade America, but I am not so sure, assuming that Hitler were successful in overcoming Russia and England, that we might not become involved in the defense of the Western Hemisphere due to our time-honored principle, the Monroe Doctrine.

Not many months ago, after visiting the grave of the Father of our Country, and driving along the banks of the Potomac on my way home, I listened to an address by the Prime Minister of England. I shall remember for many years to come the eloquent words, "Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

Judging from the expressions of my colleagues, there is little doubt that many of us took Mr. Churchill at his word, notwithstanding the fact that suggestions have been made by British generals of an expeditionary force. We have every reason to believe that the master is greater than the servant, and that the Prime Minister, in his official capacity, speaks for his Government.

As a result of this statement, and in view of our policy adopted, our position is very definite and clear-cut; that of production. This, therefore, precludes the argument that there will be another A. E. F. Like my colleagues in the Senate, I have an abhorrence of war. But if my analysis is correct as to what is involved in the amendment now before the Senate, we are not voting for war but for freedom from war. We are voting for freedom of shipping, so that we may further our policy to aid England, and thus keep war from our hemisphere.

I shall vote for the joint resolution because I feel that the principles upon which the great democracy of the United States was founded can best be maintained by the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, the American people love peace, and they hate war. That was the original premise around which the argument and debate on our foreign policy began several years ago. But the American people also love liberty and independence, and they are intelligent. They have read reams of printed matter, they have listened to radio talks, and to speeches at well-advertised public meetings. They have reached decisions. The great majority of our people reach conclusions by a process of cold reasoning. Some there are, of course, who are bewildered by emotional oratorical display, bemused by side issues of small impor-

tance, and bedeviled by appeals to fears, passions, hatreds, and other emotions. Here in the Senate we have listened to 2 weeks' debate upon a bill designed to repeal the present Neutrality Act. Arguments differ, of course, each Senator setting forth that which in his own honest judgment is best for the interests of the people of America and the future of these United States. As for myself, at this late hour in the debate I shall speak only for the RECORD.

WHERE WYOMING STANDS

In a short radio talk made by me over an N. B. C. hook-up October 1, which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD of October 27, 1941, I gave my reasons why I believed we should arm our merchant vessels and why they should be protected by our Navy on the high seas. That course I considered necessary to implement further our non-partisan American foreign policy. I also believed the great majority of the good people of Wyoming approved of my position. That belief was based upon visits to the State I have the honor, in part, to represent in the Senate. But, Mr. President, whatever value may be assigned or denied to personal interviews and correspondence, or Gallup polls, Hon. JOHN J. MCINTYRE, who represents Wyoming in the House of Representatives, recently took a poll in Wyoming which convincingly tells how our people divide on our American foreign policy and aid to Britain in her struggle to defeat Hitler and all he and his allies stand for. Mr. MCINTYRE sent to Wyoming thousands of post cards on which were certain questions calling for yes or no answers. None of these cards were addressed to particular individuals, nor were they accompanied by any argument or statement to disclose the views of Mr. MCINTYRE. The cards were addressed simply as follows: "Rural, star, or post-office boxholder—local," with request to answer the questions and return the cards. Postmasters placed these cards in the boxes of patrons of the post office, rural carriers placed them in mail boxes along their rural routes. As a consequence, they were received without preference by Republicans, Democrats, and independents; by farmers, ranchers, and residents of towns and cities. To date something over 5,000 cards have been returned.

To the question, "Should the United States Navy engage in offensive operations to enforce freedom of the seas?" 83 percent of the replies say "yes" and 17 percent say "no."

To the question, "Would you favor full military assistance to Great Britain before accepting her defeat?" 79 percent of the replies answer "yes" and 21 percent say "no."

To this question was added a secondary inquiry addressed to those answering "yes" to the main question, as follows: "If so, please indicate whether because of sympathy for England, or for the sole object of protecting the United States, or both." To this none answered because of sole sympathy for England, two-thirds of the replies answered for protection of the United States, and one-third replied for both

protection of the United States and sympathy for England.

The remaining question reads, "Should we attempt to send food for needy people in countries occupied by Germany?" To this question 15 percent answered "yes" and 85 percent answered "no."

Mr. President, the population of Wyoming is not large. What we lack in numbers is made up in the high quality and intelligence of our citizens. Many of them are descended from ancestors who lived in America during colonial days, more of them are second and third generations of ancestors who came from Ireland, Scotland, England, Germany, and other nations of northern Europe, and a substantial number are more recent arrivals or descendants from parents coming from southern Europe, all are true sons and daughters of America. In my humble opinion the people of Wyoming constitute a true cross-section of American citizenship at its best.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, in my recent radio address I canvassed the often-repeated charge that the President of the United States had violated certain planks in the national platform upon which he was re-elected in 1940, and that there was inconsistency and contradictions in some of his public utterances on our foreign policy. I shall not repeat here what I said before. To my mind the truth or falsity of these charges are of little importance in view of the changing world conditions, and the rising or falling hopes that democracy can and will survive on this earth.

If, in the light of further knowledge, and new perils to the United States, the President has seen fit to take advanced ground, I honor him for his courage to speak and act accordingly. When a man changes his mind, it is affirmative proof he has a mind capable of change with changing circumstances. When a man never changes his mind, regardless of new conditions, we are left to speculate whether he has a mind ossified, or none at all.

Neither do I stop to comment upon oblique or direct suggestions sometimes made that the President of the United States—any President—acts upon motives other than those he believes to be for the sole best interest of the United States, her institutions, and her people.

Mr. President, I, too, hate war. I, too, have witnessed its horrors, its tragedies, its destruction of life and material wealth, and its dismal and burdensome after effects. I have a son in the Army, other sons and grandnephews subject to the Selective Service Act. There are many sons of Wyoming mothers and fathers now in the armed forces of the United States, and yet many others subject to call. I am a man blessed with many friends. Among that circle of friends, a circle I ever seek to widen, there are those who will disagree with me when I cast my vote to repeal the Neutrality Act. I shall greatly regret that disagreement.

NEUTRALITY LAW NOW AIDS HITLER

The neutrality law was enacted in the hope that thereby we might remain neu-

tral, and that democracy could nevertheless defeat totalitarianism. It was enacted without knowledge or forecast of our present dangers. Hitler destroyed that hope, by the increasing ruthlessness of his now apparent determination to dominate the world, and wipe all democracies from the face of the earth. At present he seeks to force Japan into a war with this country, and is content to try for mastery of the high seas, to patrol our coasts with his submarines, his planes, and his surface raiders, to sink our ships without warning and send our sailors to watery graves. All this Hitler does in his desperate resolve to win the battle of the Atlantic and defeat England.

If Britain shall be defeated we will soon stand as sole survivors of the democracies whose people a few years ago were giving light and hope to the sons and daughters of men struggling to abolish human and economic slavery, poverty, injustice, and oppression. Democracies that sought to secure to every soul freedom of individual choice, freedom of speech, freedom to publish one's thoughts, and freedom to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

WILL THE LEOPARD CHANGE HIS SPOTS?

Mr. President, if Hitler defeats Britain and those who fight by her side, will he not then seek control of South and Central American nations, their industry, their agricultural, mineral, and forest wealth? Will he not then demand possession of English lands and islands in the Western Hemisphere? Will he not then pursue his inflexible purpose to bring "every German soul" to use his own language, under the beneficent protection of the Reich? Will he not then demand from us huge tributes to compensate him for damage done Germany by us through destruction of his murder boats and planes, and for damage resulting from material aid we rendered his adversaries through the Lend-Lease Act? Will he not continue to carry on by intrigues, by bribery, by deceit, and other "fifth column" methods to weaken our own democracy and replace it with a bastardized system leading to nazi-ism; and if the process is too slow, seek to destroy our form of government by force of arms? Will he not close the seas to us to the end we may not import those essentials we cannot produce but which are vital to our national defense? Flushed with victory, possessed with the mightiest army, navy, and air force in the history of the world, will Hitler suddenly abandon that world-domination program he has written in blood, rapine, and horrors? Will he forget the Treaty of Versailles? There may be some who think he will. They are few in number. As well expect the leopard to change his spots, the cougar to cease from killing merely to smell hot blood, or the voracious wolverine to suddenly change into a hunting dog trained to point game but not to kill.

IF WE ABANDON THE SEAS TO HITLER—WHAT THEN?

Mr. President, I am convinced that if we keep open the seas and continue to supply those who are fighting him, Hitler will be defeated over there and never

come over here. I am convinced that if Britain fails he will be here sooner or later—too soon. And if he defeats Britain we will face rejection or acceptance of the demands I have just recited. We may stave him off for a time by repudiating the Monroe Doctrine, by consenting to his acquisition of English possessions and our own strategic bases off our Atlantic coast line, by demilitarizing the Panama Canal and our other Atlantic and Pacific outposts, by submitting to his overlordship of the seas, and by sitting within the confines of continental United States—

Cabined, cribbed, confined, bound in—

because of our criminal negligence and delay. Thus enclosed we can only hope to retain a shadowy United States of America, the while struggling to keep alive a few coals in the cold ashes of democracy.

WE CANNOT RISK THE FUTURE

Mr. President, unless we basely surrender that which our forefathers bequeathed to us after heroic sacrifices of blood and treasure, Hitler, or his military successors, and his totalitarian ideology will knock at our doors from without and stab at us from within. When we then fight, as fight we will, to retain our liberties, our democracy, and our way of life, we will be in a war of greater magnitude, destruction, and horror than that now desolating Europe. That war, if it ever comes, by comparison will make our own program of help to Britain look like a tumult in some public hall while speakers are arguing the merits or demerits of our foreign policy.

Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep—

So shall thy poverty come as one that traveleth, and thy want as an armed man.

Mr. President, if we permit Britain to lose the battle of the Atlantic, then totalitarianism will come as one that traveleth, and our own destruction as an armed man whose name is Hitler.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I regard this as a very solemn occasion. The future of our country is involved, and certainly the lives of millions of the young men of the land are involved in the decision which we are about to make.

The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], based his final conclusion upon the welfare of his four grandchildren. I am willing to stake my own judgment and my vote on the welfare of my four grandchildren in this country, and I shall cast a vote on the pending question which I think will be for their benefit.

Like the Senator from Kentucky, my books can be closed tonight, and if they were closed, the auditor of my books would have to say that I had had all that was coming to me, and even more. My problem here, so far as I have one, is to try to play the part of a good citizen, so that those who come after me, both those for whom I am responsible and the others, may have a fair deal in this world.

The title of the Neutrality Act of 1939 was "to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure

the safety of its citizens and their interests."

The preamble began:

Whereas the United States, desiring to preserve its neutrality in wars between foreign states and desiring also to avoid involvement therein, voluntarily imposes upon its nationals by domestic legislation the restrictions set out in this joint resolution.

We are seeking to amend legislation passed in the interest of peace, in the interest of neutrality.

I voted for the Neutrality Act. I was deeply in favor of the repeal of the arms embargo. I did not approve those provisions of the act which restricted the rights of American citizens on the seas. I voted for them reluctantly, because they were tied to the repeal of the arms embargo. I was not impressed with the arguments made in favor of the limitations upon our ships and upon our citizens made on the floor at that time by those who are now advocating the repeal of those provisions. I was not impressed with the arguments made under the leadership of the great Senator from Idaho, the lamented Borah, who opposed the whole act. I was then in favor of the preservation of the rights of American citizens. If the freedom of the seas were involved, I should vote to retain the freedom of the seas.

Mr. President, there has been a complete misunderstanding of the meaning of the freedom of the seas. The freedom of the seas belongs to neutrals. The doctrine of freedom of the seas is limited in its application to neutrals. The United States went to war—why? Because its rights as a neutral to freedom of the seas had been denied. The United States today is not a neutral. Why? We all know the answer; it has been stated over and over. We transferred 50 destroyers to England which was an unneutral act. We passed the lease and lend bill, an act specifically designed to aid certain belligerents. We occupied Iceland. We are now repairing British warships at our expense. We have seen the joint statement of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain as to the policies they propose to pursue. We have seen the repeated declarations of the President, with which I am not disagreeing, that Hitler and Hitlerism must be destroyed and removed from the earth. Then an order has been issued by the Executive to the Navy of the United States to shoot on sight.

As was pointed out by the very able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], such an order is without warrant in the Constitution of the United States, and I do not believe the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy had the power to issue the order, but following the order there has been shooting by our vessels on the high seas.

Then we are convoying the merchant ships of a foreign government. All these circumstances indicate that we are not neutral.

It has been said on the floor that neutrality is practically a foolish dream. When we abandon neutrality, however, we abandon the right to claim the freedom of the seas.

So the situation today must be considered in the light of the fact that the United States is no longer a neutral, as it was in 1939, and that we are a partial participant in the war. I do not know what term should be applied. It is clear we are not a neutral; we are trying to think we are not at war; but we are affording active aid to one of the belligerents. So we cannot claim the rights of a neutral.

In 1939 all talked peace. We heard not a word other than peace. The question before the Senate in 1939 was whether this policy or that policy would best promote peace. We find speaker after speaker on the floor of the Senate today in substance advocating war—not quite so directly; not, perhaps, in those words, but we are told that we should not tolerate the things that have happened to us, that we should avenge them, which means fighting. When we take that position we cannot exercise the rights of a qualified belligerent involved in a sort of a quasi-war, and at the same time claim the rights of neutrals.

Mr. President, I will go as far as any other Senator to defend the rights of the United States. The rights of the United States! That is not the problem here. The problem is as to the policy which the United States shall adopt in reference to its ships upon the ocean; whether we shall continue the restrictions contained in the Neutrality Act, or whether we shall repeal those restrictions.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], like some others, has said that we cannot allow Hitler to tell our shipping where it may go. Certainly we cannot. Nor is there anything in the Neutrality Act which authorizes such a course. Under the Neutrality Act which we are considering, one man, and only one man, determines the boundaries beyond which our ships may not go, and that man is the President of the United States.

The only limitation upon our ships is that they shall not go into zones from which they are excluded by the orders of the President of the United States. Every ship of the United States, warship or mercantile ship, has the right to disregard the zones Mr. Hitler has prescribed. The question is whether we will take from the President the right we gave him to proclaim war zones and danger zones. In no way, if we retain the restrictions, do we recognize the outrageous insolence of Hitler in seeking to set aside great areas of the ocean. We merely are saying that in the interest of the avoidance of incidents which might lead to war we think it unwise for American shipping to go within the areas which the President of the United States defines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Colorado on the joint resolution has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I shall take an additional 10 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. President, if we repeal these provisions of the Neutrality Act, it means that ships will be sunk, that lives will be lost which would not be lost if we main-

tained the law as it stands. There can be no question about that. I think everyone concedes that if we send our ships into war zones some of them will be sunk and lives will be lost. We do not intentionally want to bring about such a condition, of course, but if we repeal the law, everyone who votes for the repeal will have a certain responsibility for what happens.

It is not merely a question of the lives which will be lost upon the ships which may go into the war zones; but, knowing the American people, we know what their feelings will be. It has been pointed out that the Spanish-American War arose from the sinking of one vessel. The American people outraged by the sinkings which will occur, will then demand of the Congress, perhaps, a declaration of war and a full entry into the war. We have lost 100 men through the sinking of ships. It is now proposed, as a means of avenging the loss of 100 men, that we take a course which may mean the loss of 1,000,000 men.

As was said by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], war means death and destruction. That is what it means, and that is all it means. We are urged to pursue a course which may lead us, and probably will lead us, along the line of death and destruction—death for our young men and destruction, perhaps, for our very form of government.

The line is drawn easily by some. I question the good intent of no man. I do question the judgment of some. I am speaking my own opinion, the result of much study and much thought. I am obliged in many ways to my neighbors, to my friends, to my family, and by the oath which I took on yonder stand. As I view the matter, if I should vote for the pending joint resolution I would be false to each of those obligations. That is merely my judgment. I do not say that the statement applies to any other Senator; but I could not vote without making my position plain.

The other day the question as to whether we have legal justification for war was discussed as though war were a sort of jackpot which one had to have opening cards to enter. If we want to get into the war, we do not need any further excuse. If we do not want to get in the war, my suggestion is that we pursue a course which is more likely to keep us out of war. As I have said, it is one thing to wage war to defend or enforce our rights. I do not know of any cost that we should shrink from incurring in order to defend our rights. It is another thing to decide that we are going into the war, not to defend a right but to accomplish something for somebody else.

The question is, What is the wise thing to do? Perhaps we should not say that a nation may be too proud to fight, but in some conditions it ought to be too wise to fight. I am merely interested in wisdom and in sanity. I am interested in opposing a program which, in my judgment, would result in the sacrifice of millions of American boys. The Senate and the House have been sending American boys into camp. We are about, I

fear, to send them into war. Do we ask them? No. I think the case should be clear. I think the burden is upon those who send the boys into the war to be sure that they are right.

Mr. President, my question is, Is it necessary for us to make war? The question is not, Can we find justification? I think we should seek justification to stay out. The United States is strong enough to choose its own course. We are not to be driven. We do not need to make war to demonstrate either our strength or our courage. We do not have to respond to every insult and every injury by accepting still greater injury in an effort to avenge the insult. I do not want to see our people rush into war in anger for the purpose of retribution or revenge.

I differ somewhat with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYNINGS] as to our need for greater defense. My own judgment is that at this hour there is not a nation upon the earth that could successfully attack the United States or would dare to do so. I think no one will dispute that statement. At this hour Germany is ringed about with enemies. Japan is occupied in China, and Italy is helpless. No one contends that those nations could attack us now, but it is said that some other day they may. I say that when that other day comes the efforts and the expenditures which are now being made to provide America with means of defense will have progressed so far that America will be invincible to any attack from any possible combination of nations.

We are expending \$54,000,000,000 for defense materials—a colossal program. With the defense materials which are being provided, with our Army, with our Navy, with our natural resources, and with our manpower, no nation on earth would dare attack the United States. In that respect I differ with some of my friends. I am inclined to think that we must go back to the days of witchcraft to find a parallel to present-day conditions. Then the people saw the devil under every bed. If the hub of a wagon hit a fence post it was the devil who moved the fence post over. That is the situation as I see it today.

In my judgment, the human mind has an infinite capacity to believe things that are not so. I for one am prepared to take the risks involved. I do not share the apprehension of some as to Hitler's intention toward America. I agree with them in everything they say as to the monster's atrocities in Europe; but he dare not and cannot reach this country. There are not enough ships in the ocean, even with the British Navy and the French Navy, to bring an army here and successfully invade America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw the amendment which I have heretofore offered to the committee amendment, my amendment being to strike out lines 1, 2, and 3 appearing on page 2 of the committee's amendment. However, I give notice that after the disposition of the amendment which I understand will be offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], I intend to recfer my amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when I first spoke on this resolution I tried to make it clear that, in my opinion, the passage of the joint resolution would mean war. One reason why I believe that is that the President has shown that his policy is a war policy and that the powers proposed to be given to him under the terms of the joint resolution would be used to carry out that policy. I believe that that is shown even more clearly by the speech which the President made yesterday to the International Labor Organization. He said:

The American people have made an unlimited commitment that there shall be a free world. And against that commitment no individual and no group shall prevail.

He said practically the same thing in his Navy Day speech. He said:

The shooting has started. Very simply and very bluntly, we are pledged to pull our own oar in the destruction of Hitler.

Mr. Churchill said the same thing of the Atlantic charter—that the President had pledged the United States to disarm Germany, Italy, and Japan, and had pledged the United States to the destruction of Hitler.

That pledge cannot be interpreted except as a pledge to use the men of the United States, if necessary, as well as the money and ships of the United States.

A commitment which is unlimited, as the President said yesterday, must necessarily include the sending of an American expeditionary force as much as the sending of ships. The commitment apparently now no longer relates only to Great Britain, but is a commitment that the entire world shall be free, and that we, therefore, must send our troops to every continent on earth. There is no other reasonable interpretation of the policy which the President has laid down and if we confide to such a man the powers proposed by the pending measure I think we can only expect that they will be used to produce the war which I believe they would produce no matter who might be administering the policy.

What right has the President to say that the American people have made an unlimited commitment that we shall guarantee a free world, by force, if necessary? When did they make that commitment? Only Congress, as representatives of the people, can make a pledge requiring the United States to go to war; and Congress has made no such pledge, unlimited or limited.

It is said that the lease-lend policy is a policy of defense of the United States solely by giving material aid in this country to those who come and take away the materials we are glad to furnish. Even that pledge is not unlimited. It is confined to such sums and quantities as Congress may see fit to appropriate. So I say again that a vote for the joint resolution, the President having clearly declared his own individual policy, will be one which I believe will be bound to be a vote for war.

Apparently in the same speech the President has not only pledged a free world but a prosperous one. He quotes again the fourth provision of the so-called Atlantic charter:

All states, great and small, victor and vanquished, must have access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

If that means anything it must mean that we will take down our tariffs and will give every one free access on equal terms to the rich domestic trade of the United States, as well as our foreign trade. I think it should be stated here and now that the President has no right to give any such pledge, and that Congress and the people are not making any such pledge today.

There is another proposal in this speech which seems to envision a completely fantastic foreign policy after the war toward which all this war policy is tending. The President says, after speaking of the necessity of helping all other nations:

There are so many millions of people in this world who have never been adequately fed and clothed and housed. By undertaking to provide a decent standard of living for these millions—

They number billions, as a matter of fact—

the free peoples of the world can furnish employment to every man and every woman who seeks a job.

We are going to put all our men to work by having them work on articles we are going to give away to all the nations of the world.

Apparently we are to continue for all time a kind of international W. P. A. Although we have not by any means solved our own problems at home, in the most prosperous country in the world, in spite of piling up a debt of \$20,000,000,000 in 8 years, we are now to step out and feed, clothe, and house untold millions in Europe, Asia, and Africa. The suggestion is that this will create a great prosperity in this country, and will give everyone here a job. Of course, as a matter of fact, it will tremendously reduce the standard of living in the United States if every year we must give billions away all over the world. Our own W. P. A. at one time cost nearly \$3,000,000,000 a year. What untold billions will an international W. P. A. cost? Instead of a 15-percent pay-roll tax, we shall have a 50-percent pay-roll tax if we are to carry out any such policy.

I do not wish to discuss at this time the whole implications of this extraordinary policy; but I think it is fair to say that Congress, in passing this joint resolution, is being led down the road to that policy. Unless we exercise our own judgment on measures such as the one before us, and on measures which perhaps will follow it, war will be only a prelude to bankruptcy and the end of the great democratic experiment in America.

How can the President ask for national unity when he insists on a new foreign policy which no thinking man can even defend?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for only a brief time. I feel impelled to say a few words, since this is the first important measure I have had the honor of aiding in conducting through the Senate since

I have been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to congratulate the Senate on the high plane upon which the debate has been conducted. I desire to thank Senators for their kindness, consideration, and cooperation in expediting action upon the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to offer for the RECORD some matters which I shall not read at length, unless insistence is made upon me to do so. First I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD communications from the National League of Women Voters, in support of the amendment of the Neutrality Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT URGING REPEAL OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1941.
To Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

The National League of Women Voters urges forthright repeal of the so-called Neutrality Act, with the one exception of section 12, establishing the National Munitions Control Board.

Public opinion has at last recognized the futility of attempting to legislate peace and the danger of tying the hands of government in advance of circumstances so that it is unable to exercise its constitutional functions as circumstances demand.

The League of Women Voters never approved the policy of the Neutrality Act. We have advocated a foreign policy for the United States that would discriminate among belligerents, penalize aggressor nations, give assistance to the victims of aggression. During 17 years league members have affirmed and reaffirmed their conviction that the United States cannot be secure in a world subject to periodic outbursts of armed conflicts. During the past 5 years each convention has specifically reaffirmed and restated its support of discrimination against aggressor nations.

The Neutrality Act should now be repealed to free the hands of the Congress and the Executive, restore to them their constitutional responsibilities, remove the inhibition of legislative restrictions, so that policies may be developed that will best protect the United States.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGUERITE M. WELLS,
President.

Mr. CONNALLY. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD communications from the Houston, Tex., League of Women Voters, the Milwaukee, Wis., League of Women Voters, and the Seattle, Wash., League of Women Voters, to the same effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., November 1, 1941.
The Honorable TOM CONNALLY,
Senator from Texas:
Houston League of Women Voters urges the repeal of the Neutrality Act.
MRS. HARMON ULLRICH,
Corresponding Secretary.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Milwaukee, Wis., November 4, 1941.
The Honorable THOMAS CONNALLY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: The board of directors of the Milwaukee County League of

Women Voters wishes you to know of their approval of the repeal of the neutrality law. Letters have also been written to Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY, of Wisconsin, detailing their stand. The Milwaukee County League of Women Voters has opposed the neutrality legislation ever since its enactment. The league's stand is based on belief in a foreign policy that aids the victims of aggression and discriminates against the aggressor. The Neutrality Act has endeavored to provide identical treatment of all belligerents. The league therefore would like to see the act repealed, excepting only that section dealing with the National Munitions Control Board.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. DOUGLASS VAN DYKE,
Corresponding Secretary.
Mrs. ARTHUR R. WOOLFOLK,
President.

SEATTLE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Seattle, Wash., October 28, 1941.
Senator TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: We, the members of the Foreign Policy Study Group of the Seattle League of Women Voters, thoroughly urge the forthright repeal of the Neutrality Act with the exception of section 12 establishing the National Munitions Control Board.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. W. Steel Holt, 5270 Seventeenth NE.; Mrs. Frank Beach West, 1236 East Ninety-fifth; Mrs. Ray Heffner, 4005 Fifteenth Avenue NE.; Mrs. Charles M. Gates, Box 194, Mercer Island; Mary Oakley, 5261 Sixteenth Avenue NE.; Pearl E. Pontius, 2424 Forty-first North; Mrs. Solomon Katz, 5240 Twenty-first Avenue NE.; Mrs. E. Gibbons Meyer, 1927 Fifteenth Avenue North; Vera G. Davidson, 4117 Forty-third NE.

Mr. CONNALLY. I now ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the resolution of the American Legion, in national convention at Milwaukee, Wis., in which the Legion advocates complete repeal of the Neutrality Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Whereas, we believe in our constitutional form of government and are determined that it shall be maintained as a beacon light of freedom for all nations and peoples—especially those attacked by the forces of nazism which we condemn as opposed to the rights of free men everywhere;

Whereas, the freedom of the seas has been the traditional policy of the United States since its foundation and has been so enunciated by our President; and we are opposed to any surrender of this policy or any appeasement toward the aggressor nations, Germany, Italy, and Japan—toward whom we demand a policy of stern and exact justice: Now, therefore be it;

Resolved by The American Legion in national convention assembled, That (a) we approve and endorse the foreign policy of the President and the Congress; and (b) we urge the immediate repeal of the so-called neutrality act; (c) we urge all Americans to join us in a united wholehearted, and unswerving support of our Government's foreign policy: To the end that the American way of life may survive in a world of free men. The above report was adopted.

Mr. CONNALLY. I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the

RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Maritime Union, whose membership comprises 52,000 dues-paying American seamen, advocating that seamen be protected by permitting the arming of ships.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Whereas the only function of the Neutrality Act at the present time is to limit and handicap the United States in fulfilling its declared policy of aiding Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and all other countries fighting Hitler and Hitlerism; and

Whereas Nazi attacks upon unprotected American shipping and American seamen are becoming intolerable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Maritime Union urge the immediate adoption of Senator McKellar's resolution calling for the repeal of the Neutrality Act, and that the National Maritime Union support and advocate the declared intention of the President of the United States to arm and protect American ships and American seamen carrying vitally needed supplies to the heroic peoples of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

Respectfully submitted.

ROLAND PERRY,
Chairman,
New York Membership Meeting.
E. SEYMOUR,
Recording Secretary,
New York Membership Meeting.

The above is the copy of a resolution unanimously adopted in 33 branch offices and at the headquarters of the National Maritime Union, whose membership comprises 52,000 dues-paying American seamen. It is proof and expression that the majority of American seamen who man the American ships are in unanimous accord in demanding that the disgraceful Neutrality Act be wiped from the books and that American ships ply the seven seas with the blessings of the American Government and the protection of the flag it flies.

"Don't sell America short."

Mr. CONNALLY. I also ask unanimous consent that a communication from the National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, West Coast Local 90, representing the licensed personnel of deck officers, and supporting the joint resolution, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, West Coast Local No. 90, representing the licensed personnel of deck officers, actively supports the appeal of the President of the United States that merchant vessels now be armed.

We speak as men who must take these ships to sea. We wish to make sure that the cargo will actually be delivered. The tactics of the Axis Powers demand that our merchant ships be given protection.

We therefore present to the Senate, through you, our earnest appeal that the Senate enact the necessary legislation making possible the immediate arming of merchant vessels, and the granting to them of such other protection as will assure their safety.

Respectfully,

C. F. M.,
President, West Coast Local No. 90,
National Organization of Masters,
Mates and Pilots.

Mr. CONNALLY. Likewise, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a communication received by me from the members of the National Maritime Union, aboard the steamer *Pan Florida*.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HON. THOMAS CONNALLY, Chairman,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosed herewith a resolution which was adopted unanimously at our joint meeting of the National Maritime Union held aboard the steamship *Pan Florida* September 28, 1941.

It truly represents our feelings and likewise our sincerity in backing your administration and your foreign policy of shoot on sight the Nazi rattlesnakes of the high seas.

We are wholeheartedly yours in your every effort.

R. H. RUSHTON, Ship's Delegate.
PHILIP MILLS, Chairman.
R. H. RUSHTON, Recording Secretary.

Whereas we, the American seamen, realize that there can be no peace in the world so long as the Nazi menace exists; and

Whereas we also realize that at this time the first line of defense of all the world's democracies now lies on the eastern front, where the heroic "ed" army and the Soviet people in their entirety are now engaged in a death struggle with the Nazi cannibals for the defense of country and the rest of the suppressed people of continental Europe; and

Whereas we also realize that should the Nazi rattlesnake succeed in conquering Europe, that we Americans will be next on their program of conquest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the crew of the steamship *Pan Florida*, members of the National Maritime Union, at a regular joint meeting held at sea Sunday, September 28, 1941, go on record as calling upon Congress and the President of the United States of America, F. D. Roosevelt, for an immediate declaration of war against Nazi Germany and its Fascist allies; and be it further

Resolved, That we break off diplomatic relations with all the Nazi-dominated governments, such as Vichy, France, and Mannerheim, Finland, whose countries are now ruled by vicious traitors who have traded their honor and country for personal profit, and whose agents in this country are now engaged in espionage and the spreading of foul Nazi propaganda; therefore be it finally

Resolved, That a western front be created immediately by the United States, Great Britain, and the remaining democracies of the world for the purpose of dealing a death blow to the Nazi barbarians, and likewise wipe them off the surface of the earth, so that free people may live again in peace.

PHILIP MILLER,
Chairman.
R. H. RUSHTON,
Recording Secretary.

Mr. CONNALLY. Likewise, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received by me from the Veterans Wireless Operators Association, supporting passage of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 17, 1941.
Senator CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

The Veterans Wireless Operators Association in assembly tonight in Los Angeles, has unanimously instructed me to urge the earliest possible arming of our American merchant vessels in order that we who follow the

sea may be provided with the means of protecting ourselves in the course of our duties.

LEE DE FOREST,
Honorary National President,
Veterans Wireless Operators Association.

Mr. CONNALLY. Likewise, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a telegram received by me from the International Molders and Foundry Workers Union of North America, and sundry other telegrams and communications.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, November 4, 1941.
Senator CONNALLY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,
United States Senate Building:

The executive board and officers of the International Molders and Foundry Workers Union of North America, now in session, pledge full support in fight to protect interest of American people and help forces battling against Nazi conquest and destruction. As trade unionists we are especially aware labor vital stake in outcome of war and are wholeheartedly behind proposed legislation to replace so-called Neutrality Act with law based on President Roosevelt's Navy Day declaration to effect that "our American merchant ships must be armed to defend themselves against the rattlesnakes of the sea, must be free to carry our American goods into harbors of friends, and must be protected by our American Navy."

N. D. SMITH,
Secretary, International Molders and
Foundry Workers Union of North America.

ALBANY, N. Y., October 31, 1941.
Senator CONNALLY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building:

The labor group I represent pledge our loyalty to democracy and full support in fight to protect interest of American people against Nazi conquest. We are well aware of our stake in the outcome of this war and are wholeheartedly behind legislation based on President Roosevelt's Navy Day declaration.

FRANK S. COLUMBUS,
Chairman, New York State Legislative
Board, Brotherhood of Locomotive
Firemen and Enginemen.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., November 6, 1941.
Tom CONNALLY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations
Committee, Washington, D. C.:

The Congress of Industrial Organizations Council of Rochester and vicinity, representing 30,000 organized workers, loyal to cause of democracy and national defense. Pledge full support in fight to protect interests of American people and help forces battling against Nazi conquest and destruction. As trade unionists we are especially aware of labor's vital stake in outcome of war and are wholeheartedly behind proposed legislation to replace so-called Neutrality Act with law based on President Roosevelt's Navy Day declaration to effect that "Our American merchant ships must be armed to defend themselves against the rattlesnakes of the sea. Must be free to carry our American goods into the harbors of our friends and must be protected by our American Navy."

J. H. COOPER,
President.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., November 6, 1941.
Senator Tom CONNALLY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations
Committee, Washington, D. C.:

The Rochester Joint Board, A. C. W. A., and its affiliated locals, representing 15,000

LXXXVII—547

workers, loyal to cause democracy and national defense, pledge full support in fight to protect interests of American people and help forces battling against Nazi conquest and destruction. As trade-unionists, we are especially aware labor's vital stake in outcome of war, and are wholeheartedly behind proposed legislation to replace so-called Neutrality Act with law based on President Roosevelt's Navy Day declaration to effect that "Our American merchant ships must be armed to defend themselves against the rattlesnakes of the sea. Must be free to carry our American goods into the harbors of our friends, and must be protected by our American Navy."

A. CHATMAN,
Manager, Rochester Joint Board.

HARTFORD CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Hartford, Conn., October 18, 1941.
Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the meeting of the Hartford Central Labor Union on October 15, 1941, the following resolution was adopted and copies ordered sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

"Whereas the Hartford Trades-Union Division of the Committee to Defend America is on record as being in full support of President Roosevelt's program of all-out aid to all nations fighting Hitler and his Axis partners; and

"Whereas the Roosevelt administration is taking all possible steps to send war material to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China as soon as possible: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Hartford Trades-Union Division of the Committee to Defend America go on record as being in favor of the following two proposals now being made to Congress by the Roosevelt administration:

"1. Any revision of the Neutrality Act or repeal if necessary to insure the safe delivery of war material to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

"2. Inclusion of the Soviet Union in the new lend-lease bill along with Great Britain so that the United States may give the maximum contribution of war material to these allies fighting against Hitler in this crucial phase of the war."

Sincerely yours,

FRANK MORRIS,
Acting Secretary.

CLEVELAND INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL,
Cleveland, Ohio, October 27, 1941.
The Honorable THOMAS CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations
Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the delegates to the Cleveland Industrial Union Council at its meeting of October 22.

It is our firm conviction that the recommendations made therein represent not only the opinion of the delegates to the council and the thousands of workers they represent, but that they are the convictions of the overwhelming majority of the working people of Cleveland who want action now in defense of democracy.

Very truly yours,

CLEVELAND INDUSTRIAL
UNION COUNCIL,
By A. E. STEVENSON, Secretary.

REPEAL OF NEUTRALITY LAW AND DEFENSE OF
DEMOCRACY

Whereas Hitler has seen fit to begin a shooting war against the United States of America by torpedoing unarmed American merchant vessels in zones which have been established as neutral zones by the warring nations; and

Whereas it is now an established fact that Germany has pushed us into the war regard-

less of the wishful thinking of some people; and

Whereas the best interests of our Nation and people lie in defending ourselves and our lands against such piratical attacks as Hitler has launched against us; and

Whereas the most effective way to defend ourselves is to shoot first at the ones attacking us; and

Whereas the policy of our Nation of aid to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China is hampered because of the so-called neutrality law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cleveland Industrial Union Council goes on record calling for:

1. Immediate repeal of the so-called neutrality law.

2. Guaranteeing aid to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China by conveying supplies to ports of those nations.

3. Endorsement of the recent conference of 500,000 British trade-unionists calling for the immediate opening of a western front against Hitler.

(Adopted by Cleveland Industrial Union Council October 22, 1941.)

NEW YORK, N. Y., November 15, 1941.
Hon. Tom CONNALLY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We thank you most sincerely for the splendid efforts you are making to protect the interest of us all and to render futile those who seem to be sympathizing with the Nazis.

FRANK GILLMORE,
President, Associated Actors
and Artists of America.

NEWARK, N. J., October 25, 1941.
SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.:

Executive board, Hosiery Workers, No. 49,
urge support of President's desires on Neutrality Act.

ED BEHNKE, President.

I was instructed by the National Board of the American Guild of Variety Artists at their meeting on September 19, 1941, to send you a copy of a resolution which was passed by the Council of Actors' Equity Association at its meeting on September 16, and which has been approved and passed by the National Board of the American Guild of Variety Artists.

"Whereas the Senate subcommittee has been instigated by Senators BURTON K. WHEELER, D. WORTH CLARK, and GERALD P. NYE, to effect an inquiry into the operations of the motion-picture industry; and

"Whereas it is clear that the purpose of the inquiry is to block the production of anti-Nazi motion pictures, and to effect a censorship on the free expression of American culture to which the Actors' Equity Association is unalterably opposed; and

"Whereas the inquiry has quickly indicated that it is designed to breed religious and racial discord in our Nation, thereby to destroy the unity of the vast majority of the American people who support the foreign policy of the Nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved: That we, the Actors' Equity Association, do hereby condemn the actions of the subcommittee as an immediate threat to free thought, free speech and to the very fundamentals of liberty upon which our great Nation was founded, and strongly recommend that this inquiry be stopped."

As stated above the American Guild of Variety Artists has approved the above resolution.

Fraternally yours,
AMERICAN GUILD OF VARIETY ARTISTS,
GERALD GRIFFIN,
National Executive Secretary.

Whereas the Hartford Trade Union Division of the Committee To Defend America is on record as being in full support of President Roosevelt's program of all-out aid to all nations fighting against Hitler and his Axis partners.

And whereas the Roosevelt administration is taking all possible steps to send war material to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China as soon as possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Hartford Trade Union Division of the Committee To Defend America go on record as being in favor of the following two proposals now being made to Congress by the Roosevelt administration:

1. Any revision of the Neutrality Act or repeal if necessary to insure the safe delivery of war material to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

2. Inclusion of the Soviet Union in the new lend-lease bill along with Great Britain so that the United States may give the maximum contribution of war material to these allies fighting against Hitler in this crucial phase of the war.

Fraternaly,

COLT'S INDUSTRIAL UNION, LOCAL 270,

SID GUNNING, *President*.

STEPHEN CHESKY, *Recording Secretary*.

DRESSMAKERS UNION,

New York, N. Y., October 17, 1941.

HON. TOM CONNALLY,

Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May we call to your attention the enclosed resolution, adopted unanimously on October 16, 1941, at a regular membership meeting of our organization, Dressmakers Union, Local 22, I. L. G. W. U. The meeting was attended by over 5,000 dressmakers, and the resolution adopted expresses the sentiment of virtually every one of our 28,000 members.

We would strongly urge you to do everything in your power to speed the passage of the new lend-lease legislation, including provisions for aid to Russia, and the revisions of the Neutrality Act requested by the President. As our resolution declares, "The time has now come for a cessation of talk and a beginning of action."

Very respectfully yours,

CHAS. S. ZIMMERMAN,

Secretary-Manager.

Resolution adopted by Local 22, Dressmakers Union of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union at a general membership meeting held at Manhattan Center on Thursday evening, October 16, 1941

Whereas the world-wide struggle against nazi-ism has now entered upon a decisive phase the outcome of which may determine the whole future of mankind; and

Whereas victory for Nazi Germany would mean the triumph of the most ruthless barbarism over the world, the triumph of dictatorship, racial persecution, national oppression, economic enslavement, and social and cultural degradation; while the defeat of Nazi Germany would not only save mankind from this terrible fate but would also open a way for the building of a better and a freer world in the future; and

Whereas of all sections of the population, organized labor has most at stake in this war because a Nazi victory, would wipe out all of labor's gains of decades and centuries, its rights, its liberties, its standards, its organizations, its freedom of action, as has already happened in Germany, Italy, and the Nazi-occupied countries of Europe; and

Whereas the paramount issue facing the world and this country today is unyielding, uncompromising struggle against Nazi Germany until victory has been achieved; and

Whereas the splendid resistance of the Russian armies has raised a new hope among the foes of nazi-ism all over the world by keeping vast German armies and air fleets

engaged on the eastern front thus giving Britain and the United States a much-needed breathing spell for intensified industrial mobilization and military preparation; so that the great Russian armies, while heroically fighting their own battle for their own country, for their own independence, are also fighting for the freedom and independence of Britain and America; and

Whereas Congress is now considering various pieces of legislation designed to strengthen and render more effective American aid to Britain and Russia in the fight against Hitlerism; and

Whereas there are still many in this country who hesitate about, or even oppose, sending aid to Russia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Dressmakers Union, Local 22, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, in membership meeting assembled:

1. That we express our admiration of the courage and determination with which the British people have met the murderous Nazi onslaught from the air and with which they have prosecuted the war despite immense difficulties and suffering.

2. That we hail the courageous resistance of the Russian armies to the murderous Nazi invader and urge that all possible military and economic assistance be extended to the Soviet Union. We urge this aid to be extended promptly, speedily, and effectively. In the interest of democracy and the defense of America, we call for a cessation of talk and the beginning of action.

3. That we call upon Congress to repeal outright the present Neutrality Act as a bar and a hindrance to our mounting efforts to aid Britain and Soviet Russia in the fight against nazi-ism.

4. That we call upon Congress promptly to pass the new lend-lease legislation with inclusion of provisions of effective aid to Russia.

5. That we extend our sympathy and solidarity to the peoples of the occupied countries of Europe, whose resistance to Nazi domination is rapidly growing, and pledge to them that we will not let up in our fight until the battle is won and their freedom and independence restored.

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS ORDER,

New York, N. Y., October 20, 1941.

HONORABLE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,

White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: Five hundred Russian-Americans, gathered at a meeting at the Sokol Hall, in the city of Newark, N. J., under the auspices of the International Workers Order, view with alarm the aggression of Hitler and his representatives, the appeasers in this country.

We see the present war and the aggression of Nazi-ism as a menace to the safety of our country. We are also doubly moved by the heroism of the British and Russian fighters.

This meeting went on record as approving the national and foreign policy of the Administration, in its effort to defend our country by defeating Hitler and Hitlerism. We support increased funds for the lease-lend bill and urge that aid to the embattled armies be sent as speedily as possible. Furthermore, we support the outright repeal of the Neutrality Law.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY PILUTIK,

Chairman of the Meeting.

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

UNITED OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL

WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL NO. 27,

Washington, D. C., October 22, 1941.

HON. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,

President of the United States,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are happy to inform you that the members of Local 27,

United Office and Professional Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, at a regular meeting on October 14, 1941, voted support of your request to allow the arming of merchant ships.

The United Office and Professional Workers of America of Washington took this action because it recognized the necessity of giving complete support to Great Britain and the Soviet Union in their fight against our common enemy, Hitler.

Labor supports all-out aid to Britain and the Soviet Union because we know the terror and destruction that has been visited upon labor in Nazi-conquered countries and realize what nazi-ism would mean to labor in our own country.

All organized labor has in recent months pointed out the shortcomings of the defense production program and offered its support in any campaign to produce more defense materials for our allies, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. At the present time, when production is far from what it should be, it is essential that every step be taken to guarantee swift and safe delivery of defense materials to the nations fighting Hitlerism.

You may be sure of our continued cooperation in this campaign.

Sincerely yours,

SADIE SOKOLOVE,

President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Texas have a copy of the resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Philadelphia, Pa., in its forty-second national encampment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not seem to have.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have a copy of the resolution, and I ask the Senator to include that with the ones he asks to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 260—ENDORING MEASURES TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT TO DEFEND AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Whereas it is generally recognized that individual freedom and liberty throughout the world are jeopardized by acts of the leaders within certain nations who seek to impose their totalitarian doctrines on other nations by force of arms; and

Whereas the United States of America is legislatively and historically committed to defend and preserve the American way of life and is in direct opposition to any Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or other totalitarian ideology which threatens to endanger our individual freedoms and liberties; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has recognized the imminent and growing danger to our own liberties and institutions from totalitarian aggression and has authorized the expenditure of billions of dollars for our own national defense and to aid those countries now resisting such aggression; and

Whereas our Government has recognized the need for a strong Army and Navy and has authorized the mobilization of manpower through selective service training and other acts: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assembled in Philadelphia, Pa., in its Forty-second National Encampment, go on record wholeheartedly endorsing and supporting those measures be-

ing taken by the Government of the United States of America to defend and perpetuate the American way of life from any and all aggressors.

Submitted by committee on resolutions.
Adopted by the encampment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Lawyers Guild, a very liberal organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Whereas neutrality legislation was adopted in the belief that our national security would be promoted thereby; and

Whereas events have demonstrated that the Neutrality Act is inimical to the defense and security of the United States, which are seriously menaced by the ever-expanding Nazi aggression; and

Whereas the existing neutrality legislation on our statute book has long become obsolete in view of our national policy, expressed in the Lease-Lend Act, to aid all nations resisting aggression; and

Whereas the restrictions imposed by virtue of the Neutrality Act serve to endanger the lives of citizens of the United States and to hinder our most effective aid to those peoples battling Nazi barbarism; and

Whereas the continued existence of the Neutrality Act is utilized by appeasement and defeatist elements to confuse the people and to obstruct the program of national defense, and the repeal of the Neutrality Act, authorized in the preamble thereof, would reflect public opinion in support of the President's foreign policy and give added encouragement to those nations resisting fascist aggression and tyranny: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Lawyers Guild, fully supporting the President's policy, declares that the time has come to throw all our resources into the fight against Hitlerism and therefore favors the repeal of the Neutrality Act, so as to preserve the freedom of the seas, to permit American vessels to deliver all aid to those nations resisting aggression, to permit the arming of American vessels, and to eliminate all those restrictions which are inimical to the defense and security of the United States. We favor the salvage, through the enactment of new legislation, of those provisions establishing the Munitions Control Board to license the export of war material.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have before me a letter from James E. Shepard, president of the North Carolina College for Negroes, and attached letters from professors and students of other colleges, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE FOR NEGROES,
Durham, October 21, 1941.
Senator TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the minority group of this country, I desire to earnestly petition you and your committee to pass without delay the bill to arm merchant ships, and I also desire to ask that the committee go still further and repeal the whole Neutrality Act.

We are facing in America today one of the gravest crises which we have ever confronted. The American people, fortunately, regardless of race or creed, are awakening to this fact, even though it has been a slow awakening.

You will find the Negro group 100 percent American. They have no other flag or land, and they are ready to march at the call of duty. All that they are asking is that they be given a chance to enjoy the fruits of democracy, and to make our country typically the land of the free and the home of the brave. The rainy day is upon us now, and those who shout that the skies are clear and that there is no danger do not represent either wisdom or knowledge.

The Negro in this hour of peril is willing to forget any differences, any prejudices or rights, and march side by side with people from every section of the country in their effort to insure freedom and life to all citizens, and to leave a heritage of freedom to generations following. There must be no divisions, there must be unity of purpose and highest endeavors to put forth the safety of us all. I earnestly ask that you and your great committee carefully consider this matter and speedily reach a decision.

With great respect, I am
Very truly yours,

JAMES E. SHEPARD,
President

TRINITY COLLEGE,
Hartford, Conn., October 21, 1941.
Hon. TOM CONNALLY.

Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The undersigned, members of Trinity College faculty, respectfully urge action by your committee either to repeal the Neutrality Act or to so amend it as to unshackle the Government of the United States.

This request is based upon the following considerations:

The Neutrality Act is not the measure which its name implies. It is not an act which strengthens neutral rights. On the contrary, it is a piece of legislation which strikes at the very foundation of the rights of neutrals under international law. For if the mightiest nation is willing to abandon her rights as a neutral for fear of getting in the way of an aggressor nation, no other nation will have the temerity in the future to assert her rights as a neutral.

The act contravenes our age-old policy of the freedom of the seas. It unduly limits the freedom of action of our Government.

The act is not only incompatible with the other laws adopted by the Congress with the intention of helping to defeat Hitler, but it also partially nullifies the effectiveness of those laws.

The act has helped our mortal enemies and handicapped our friends and virtual allies in their life and death struggle with the aggressors.

Furthermore, the Neutrality Act has promoted war by virtually telling Hitler that he had a free hand so far as the United States was concerned. Although it was passed by Congress with the hope that it would promote peace, the events of the last few years have shown that there was no sound basis for such a hope. It is claimed that the act has kept this country out of the war. But that is a specious argument. Hitler, and not the act, has so far kept us out of the war, so that he might be able to carry out his "one by one" policy.

The act has placed the United States in the ridiculous position of having to sail some of her ships under the protection of the flag of such a tiny national as Panama. It is strange, indeed, that the country which in its youth cleaned the Barbary Coast of pirates should now, when it is the mightiest nation of the world, forbid her ships and citizens the freedom of the seas for fear of what the pirates of today might choose to do.

For the self-respect and security of the United States it is imperative that this mistaken and misnamed piece of legislation be

repealed or so amended as to restore us our rights as a free nation.

Lawrence Laforce, Arthur Adams, Henry A. Perkins, Al R. Wadlund, H. M. Dadourian, Vernon K. Kruble, J. W. Burger, R. Walker Scott, Sterling B. Smith, J. H. Bissonette, W. C. Lothrop, J. A. Notopoulos, A. H. Hughes, H. C. Asquith, John Ch. Taylor, W. G. Wendell, Edward L. Troxell, C. L. Altman, D. D. Morgan, Louis H. Naylor, Norton Coe, George Brinton Cooper, Maurice Bates, T. L. Hood, Alfred K. Mitchell, B. W. Means, H. C. Swan, R. Bert Hutt, F. C. Copeland, Clarence E. Walters, Ray Josting, Ralph W. Eufson, Walter E. McCloud, Alfonso S. Allen, T. S. Wadlow, N. C. Helmhold, J. A. Brull, John F. Wyckoff, Thomas L. Downs, Jr., D. E. Jessee, Joseph C. Clarke, Lester V. Chandler, Philip C. Taylor, E. D. Myers.

Senator TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

We, the undersigned members of Radcliffe College, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to repeal the Neutrality Act and to extend lease-lend aid to Russia, in order to insure the defeat of Hitler, and the safety of our country.

Charlotte Farrell, Cecile Colin, Elizabeth Goucher, Elizabeth D. Parker, Margaret Ann Dewey, Helen K. Roelker, Judith Friedburg, Clara Claiborne, Lucile Webb, Philipp Durham, Barbara Gutmann, Ann Sewall Mervin, Dora Sander, Eva Marie Bendix, Geraldine A. Cohn, Frances Hermann, Mary Cutting, Marjorie Flickinger, Irene V. Bellot, Terrell Porter, Edith Hevlin, Doris Kaplan, B. Bersehr, Lillian Foerster, Rhoda Craven, Edith Barowsky, Ruth Knowlton, Martha Land, Faith Weil, Eleanor Barrows Doermann, Eleanor Chestnut, Sonota Rowe, Lee Nelken, Harriet Rodebush, Terry McGovern, Wendy Bragdon, Sylvia Sugarman, E. Ross, M. Buckley, Shirley Mitchell, Edith Small, Gerry Lux, Persis Joan Todd, Dorothy Goodnoh, Nancy Felix, Mary Bonnlander, Barbara Barnes, Ruth Hoffmann, Margaret Stokes, Marion Kopel, Gillian Norton, Frances Kramer, C. Bartlett, Rulan Chao, Elisabeth Swift, J. Barap, L. Beresnack, E. Clark, E. White, Nancy Hopkins, Mary Frances Smith, Deborah Sporn, P. A. Frieman, Jane Emmet, Jessie Howes, Barbara Alice Wolfe, Marie W. Hill, Sibyl Beckett, Irene Portis, Eleanor Gordon, Amy Olney, Mary Thorpe, Cynthia Phillips, Juliet Peverley, Eleanor Burke.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE,
South Hadley, Mass., October 31, 1941.
Senator TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: The following petition has been signed by 298 members of the Mount Holyoke Community and sent to the President of the United States:

"Believing that the Neutrality Act does not accomplish its stated purpose of promoting the security of the United States, we advocate ultimate repeal of the entire act. In accord with the policy of the administration at this time, we urge immediate repeal not only of section 6 prohibiting the arming of American merchant ships but also of section 2, which prohibits American merchantmen from

carrying goods to belligerents, and of section 3, which prohibits American merchantmen from entering combat zones as defined by the President."

One hundred and forty-seven students and one hundred and fifty-one members of the administration, faculty, and staff signed this petition. About 75 percent of the administration and faculty are included. More student signatures will follow.

Many signers wish to specify that their demand for repeal of the Neutrality Act is not to be interpreted as disapproval of the Munitions Control Board, which they hope to see continued under new legislation.

We urge you to do everything in your power to speed carrying out the requests of the petition.

Yours very truly,

ALICE CRICHTET,
Chairman, Mount Holyoke Committee
to Defend America by Aiding the
Allies.

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE,
Lynchburg, Va., October 16, 1941.
HON. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: I am enclosing a copy of a petition which the members of the faculty and staff of Randolph-Macon Woman's College have just forwarded to President Roosevelt. The names of the signers of the petition are typed at the bottom of the page.

We shall be glad to see the present proposal for the arming of merchant ships pass Congress, but we believe that Congress should go further, and repeal the Neutrality Act in its entirety.

Yours very truly,

HELEN PEAK,
Professor of Psychology.

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE,
Lynchburg, Va., October 14, 1941.
HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned members of the faculty and staff of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, recognize the limitations which the Neutrality Act exercises upon American foreign policy. We believe that existing circumstances demand decisive and unhampered action on the part of the Chief Executive to the end that the full power of the United States shall be brought to bear in the interest of an early victory for the democracies.

We urge, therefore, that you ask the Congress to repeal the Neutrality Act in its entirety in order that you may have the greatest possible freedom in fashioning an American foreign policy that is adequate for the protection of our own Nation and decisive in its aid for the embattled democracies.

Respectfully yours,

Agnes Addison, J. T. Morgan, William Scott, Elizabeth E. Wright, Marjorie S. Harris, Herbert C. Lipscomb, Paul N. Guthrie, Catharine Murphy, Gillie A. Larew, Martha S. Bell, Elizabeth Stubbs, Mary B. Stokes, Kathleen M. Scruggs, Willie T. Weathers, Elizabeth M. Knake, B. Minor Davis, Eleanor Jones, Isabel Boggs, Martha Goodwin, Annie C. Whiteside, Cornelia R. Nicholas, Frances A. Schofield, Helen Peak, C. Clement French, Susie M. Ames, Roberta D. Cornelius, S. T. M. Harmanson, Lena B. Henderson, Mabel K. Whiteside, Mary T. Williams, Nan V. Thornton, Mabel Davidson, Mary Virginia Kagey, Sarita Hopkins, A. A. Kern, Theodore H. Jack, Aileen M. Bond, Virginia Ballard, Henry Hallstrom, Agnes Crawford, Schult, Helene M. Crooks, Evelyn Raskin, Robert D. Meade, Mary S. Guthrie.

Mr. CONNALLY. I also ask, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received by me from the national chairman of the Fight For Freedom Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., October 24, 1941.
Senator TOM CONNALLY, Chairman,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building:

Adolf Hitler hates representative government. He has pledged himself and his satanic satellites to destroy it. He has told the world, again and again, that democracy has never worked, never will. We of the Fight For Freedom are certain he is wrong. We demand that the Senate of the United States prove he is. Not even a small minority in the United States has any illusions about the battle against Nazi-ism. No one is neutral. There are only those millions of us who are Hitler's enemies, a few who are confused and a raucous-voiced handful who are his friends. There is no middle ground.

We of the Fight For Freedom, representing millions of democracy-demanding citizens of this country, ask that the Senate of the United States repeal the deceitful Neutrality Act that finds militant support in Berlin, in Rome, in Tokyo, but little or none in our own Nation. We further ask that the Senate of the United States not commit this country to national suicide by evasive, dishonest, half-hearted attempts to defeat Hitlerism. Freedom is the badge of courage. It is the exclusive possession of those who are brave enough to fight for it.

If the Senate of the United States fails to heed the crescendo of American opinion, liberty will not survive. Nazi-ism will win. If our representative government fails to represent the victorious Fascist survivors who write the history of our tragic time will point to this country's example with pride. Our own democratic institutions will have paved the way for the victory of the Nazi way of life.

The RIGHT REVEREND HENRY W. HOBSON,
National Chairman, Fight For Freedom.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, very briefly, I wish to suggest to Senators that I can never agree to the assumption made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as he closed his remarks, that the mere passage of the joint resolution would be a commitment to war. The passage of the joint resolution would in no wise change the status of the United States as to war. The Congress still would have all the power it now has. Our ships now are being sunk; and if that would be cause for war after the passage of the joint resolution, it is already cause for war.

Many Senators who oppose passage of the joint resolution say we are not prepared for war. We are not prepared for war as I would wish we were prepared; but I am happy to be able to say to the Senate that if we are not prepared it is not the fault of the Senator from Texas. Some of those who are now opposing the joint resolution resisted the building up of our Navy and the increasing of our armed forces. I say it in no spirit of criticism; they had a right to do it. The Senator from Texas was pleading, years and years and years ago, that we should build the greatest and the most powerful navy that rides the seven seas.

Mr. President, Senators speak of hazards. Of course, there is a hazard. I cannot say that we shall not have a war.

I have no assurance that if the joint resolution were defeated we should not have a war. Life is filled with hazards. Nations, as well as individuals, must take hazards. When we are born there is a hazard. Our mothers hazard their lives. As infants, we hazard smallpox and measles and all the ailments of childhood. We hazard our lives when we step out on the streets of a great, crowded city. Of course, there is a hazard; but we must take hazards, whether we went to take them or not. If we do not take the hazards, the hazards probably will take us anyway.

But, Mr. President, we speak of rights—rights purchased with the blood and treasure of those whom we honor. Let me say to Senators that rights which are not insisted upon, rights for which we do not demand respect, soon cease to be rights. Use not your arms, and they shrivel at your sides. If we permit the rights of Americans and American nationals, the rights of our country, to be insulted and flouted, there will come a time when they will no longer be rights, but mere echoes of a once grand and glorious past.

Mr. President, Hitler did not make the sea. God made the sea, and He set the heavens ablaze with stars to guide mariners, and gave the sea to all the nations of the earth. I shall never be willing for the United States to bow the knee and say to Mr. Hitler, "We shall give you the sea. You may rule the waves. You shall be the dictator, have the mastery, and determine where every pilot and every mariner shall guide his craft."

Mr. President, when God made the sea, He did not place a swastika upon it; and I shall not vote to badge it all over with that symbol of tyranny, might, force, murder and infamy, if you please.

Much has been said about the attitude of the great departed Senator Borah. There was no one in this chamber who entertained for him a deeper affection or a higher respect than did the Senator from Texas. I flatter myself that I enjoyed a close, intimate friendship with Senator Borah. He did oppose many of the measures to which reference has been made; but let me quote the last words that Senator Borah uttered when he closed the debate on October 2, 1939, on the so-called Neutrality Act. These are not the words of one who would surrender our rights; these are not the words of one who, in abject humiliation, in order to avoid hazards, would give up the rights of America. This is what Senator Borah said:

I am hopeful—

I will say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that he need not take down what I am about to read. I will give it to the Senator in a minute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can remember what the Senator from Idaho said. I am taking down what the Senator from Texas says.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very happy to be associated with such company. Senator Borah said:

I am hopeful that we will be able to prevent war. I do not know whether we shall be able to do so or not. That is in the lap of the gods. I have only this to say, that neither Germany nor Great Britain nor any

other power, if they so much as deign to notice my remarks, should for a moment fail to conclude that if the rights of America are invaded, if our property is destroyed, if our people are murdered, if our sovereignty is attacked, I shall vote to meet the enemy on the field of war: It is America; America with peace if possible, but America.

Those were the last words that the great statesman and magnificent orator from Idaho uttered upon that occasion.

Mr. President, that is not the doctrine of surrender. That is the doctrine of standing by the side of our rights with drawn swords to protect them and to insist upon them and to defy those who would violate them.

Mr. President, without insistence upon our rights, without willingness to resist those who would assail them, and without willingness to spend of our treasure and of our blood, if necessary, our rights never will be respected.

I pray God that we may never have a war. I want to impress upon Senators that the passage of the joint resolution does not mean, as some Senators assume, that automatically we shall enter the war. It changes our status not a jot or tittle. It simply withdraws, by domestic legislation, the imposition which we voluntarily imposed upon ourselves not to enjoy our undeniable and inalienable rights for our ships to go out upon the high seas, upon the highway which belongs to all nations and not to the little master of a painted empire upon a painted imagination.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at the start of the consideration of the joint resolution I offered, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and myself, a motion in the form of an amendment, which was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, for the outright repeal of the Neutrality Act. I feel the same way today that I felt on the day the amendment was offered. I think it constitutes the frank approach to the question. I believe it would accomplish much more, certainly psychologically, the world over, than the joint resolution reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

At this time I desire to ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], if he will accept our amendment in place of the joint resolution reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, allow me to say to the able and distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that those of us who are supporting the joint resolution have very greatly appreciated the strong and vigorous aid which he has given to our cause, and we very much regret that we cannot accept the text as he offers it. We hope that in the spirit of the fine unity and cooperation which he has already manifested he will not insist upon offering the amendment for total repeal, because we believe the joint resolution as it stands will accomplish all the substantial and vital purposes which the Senator had in mind when he and his associates offered the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that, while I am very much opposed to the so-called Willkie amendment—

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that this is an amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and myself, if he will please term it the Austin-Bridges-Gurney amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will term it anything the Senator from New Hampshire wants me to; but I think that even the least respect for the late putative Republican candidate—for whom I have very little respect—demands a vote on this question. While I am very much opposed to the Bridges-Austin-Gurney amendment, I do think it is better than the emasculatation of the Neutrality Act under another name. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that if he does not offer the amendment which he proposed, I myself, being very much opposed to it but thinking that as a substitute for the committee amendment it is very much preferable, will afford the Senate an opportunity to vote on Mr. Willkie.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the joint resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations accomplishes in major part the desired objectives of the Senators who offered the amendment. It does not by any means accomplish entirely our desired objective. We feel exactly the same about the amendment as on the day we offered it. We are for outright repeal. I personally voted against the Neutrality Act, and I have been consistent ever since, and am against it today. But in the interest of unity we will not offer our amendment, and we will support the pending joint resolution as reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment of the time of the Senate.

The Neutrality Act embraces 20 sections. I supported the bill when it was before the Senate for consideration. I have supported the various bills for strengthening our national defense. I have supported the appropriations necessary to meet the expenses of our defense program.

Recently the President submitted a recommendation that section 6 of the Neutrality Act should be repealed. The other body of the Congress, acting upon his recommendation, passed House Joint Resolution 237, proposing to repeal section 6 of the act. The joint resolution came to this body for consideration. The committee to which the joint resolution was referred reported it back in substance, repealing section 6, but added the recommendation that sections 2 and 3 likewise be repealed.

Mr. President, it is my contention that upon request of any Member of the Sen-

ate a division could be had of the first section of the joint resolution, because it embraces the proposed repeal of two sections.

My desire is to leave upon the statute books section 3 of the Neutrality Act. Section 1 gives the President power to declare that a state of war exists between two or more nations. As more nations enter the war, he has a right to amend his proclamation by adding the new states.

Section 3 provides that the President can define a combat area around the warring nations.

Under section 1 and under section 3 the President has full authority to handle the matter as he sees proper. To the end that I may have a chance to vote to retain section 3, I submit an amendment, and ask that it be reported from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, lines 2 and 3, after the parenthesis, it is proposed to strike out the comma and the rest of the line and all of line 3, down to and including the word "are," and to insert the word "is."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the amendment submitted should be agreed to, section 1 of the pending joint resolution would read as follows:

That section 2 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (relating to commerce with states engaged in armed conflict) is hereby repealed.

The adoption of the amendment would leave section 3 of the Neutrality Act on the statute books. This section prevents the sending of our ships into combat zones.

In order that the record may be complete, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of section 1 of the existing Neutrality Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, section 1 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

(b) Whenever the state of war which shall have caused the President to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section shall have ceased to exist with respect to any state named in such proclamation, he shall revoke such proclamation with respect to such state.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that at this point the complete text of section 3 of the Neutrality Act be included as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, section 3 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMBAT AREAS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both.

(b) In case of the violation of any of the provisions of this section by any American vessel, or any owner or officer thereof, such vessel, owner, or officer shall be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the owner of such vessel be a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty hereinabove prescribed. In case of the violation of this section by any citizen traveling as a passenger, such passenger may be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

(c) The President may from time to time modify or extend any proclamation issued under the authority of this section, and when the conditions which shall have caused him to issue any such proclamation shall have ceased to exist he shall revoke such proclamation, and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I ask for a yea and nay vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before I discuss for a very brief moment the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, I wish to pay what I think is a deserved tribute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have been intimately associated with the Senator from Texas, from a legislative and personal standpoint, for many years. He and I served in the House of Representatives together.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, especially in times such as these, is one of the outstanding committees of the Senate, or of the Congress, I might say. The Senator from Texas assumed the chairmanship of this committee recently, when the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who was a great chairman of that committee, and who is a great Senator, relinquished the post of chairman of the committee to become Chairman of the Committee on Finance.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Texas on the diplomacy, the fairness, and the statesmanlike qualities which he has exemplified in the handling of this great piece of legislation before the United States Senate. I do this unreservedly, because I think the Senator from Texas is entitled to have this expression of our confidence in him and in his ability in the conduct of the measure before us through the Senate.

Now a word about the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I regret whenever I feel compelled to disagree with anything sug-

gested by the Senator from Oklahoma. He and I, as in the case of the Senator from Texas, served in the House of Representatives together, and we came to the Senate together. There is no man in the Senate for whose convictions and for whose character and personality I have greater respect.

However, the amendment which the Senator has offered in effect leaves section 3 of the so-called neutrality law in effect. It would repeal section 2, which deals with belligerent ports. The repeal of section 2 would permit our ships to go into belligerent ports, but the failure to repeal section 3 would prevent our ships from going through zones prescribed by the President in order to get to belligerent ports. That, in a nutshell, would be the effect of the Senator's amendment.

I agree that the President has the power, under section 3, to modify or even to lift the proclamations which he has issued setting out war zones, or zones of conflict, through which American ships cannot pass, but it seems to me inconsistent to provide, as we are proposing to do, that our ships may go into belligerent ports, but also provide that they cannot go through the zones prescribed by the President in order to get to belligerent ports.

I realize that the President may modify his proclamations, he may lift them altogether; but I do not believe the President should be required to exercise a technical authority which he may possess by lifting the war zones, or modifying them, in order that our ships may go into belligerent ports whose entry we are providing for in the pending joint resolution.

I can say to the Senator from Oklahoma and to the Senate that, although the President in his message to the Congress emphasized the repeal of section 6 as immediately necessary, he called our attention to other restrictions, and in those other restrictions the President had in mind sections 2 and 3. Because of a situation which then existed, he did not feel at liberty to urge specifically the repeal of sections 2 and 3, but I can say to the Senator from Oklahoma and to the Senate that from the very outset the President has felt that sections 2, 3, and 6 were inseparably linked together, and that whatever we did about one of them should be done about all three of them.

For these reasons, with the greatest respect and deference to the Senator from Oklahoma, I venture to wish that the Senate will not adopt the amendment which he has offered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Knowing the President's attitude on all these matters in general, is it too much to say that the President does not want the power under section 3 as it now exists, does not want to be embarrassed by having to exercise these high functions, but wants Congress to have the power?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is to the President's credit to say that he feels that Congress having enacted section 3, he does not desire to take any technical

advantage of any power he has under it to countermand or countervail the wishes of Congress in this matter. He feels that Congress itself should act on section 3, instead of requiring him to exercise some technical authority by a modification of section 3, or by the lifting of a proclamation to get rid of section 3 by Executive order, instead of by congressional action.

For the reasons I have stated, I hope the Senator's amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Kentucky in the encomiums he has pronounced on the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I have found him in this trying time to be courteous, kindly, and I think, wholly fair. I can say no more concerning him.

Mr. President, a little over 24 years ago I sat in the House Chamber, in a joint meeting of the Houses of Congress, listening to a President tell us why it was necessary to enter into war. I listened then, first, because I was new to the Congress, secondly, because of the words of the President. I recall his first line. He said:

It is terrible to take this great, peaceful country of ours into war.

Then he spoke his reasons for wishing that to be done. His words had upon me an effect which I have never forgotten. I spent that night almost sleepless, thinking of war and what war meant. I feel somewhat in that condition today, especially after the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] delivered his peculiarly apt speech respecting the situation which we face. I felt 24 years ago it was a terrible thing to take this country into war. I feel tonight, sir, upon the eve of that perhaps being accomplished, that it is a terrible thing to take this country into war.

I speak tonight under some handicaps, but I have the feeling, sir, that no man can do more when the time comes than to speak as he thinks he should speak in behalf of his country.

And how can man die better
Than facing fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his gods?

Tonight I have a feeling, sir, that scarce lets me speak concerning what we are about to do. I have the feeling, sir, that we are committing a grave mistake, that we are placing our country in a peril which I cannot adequately describe.

I think, sir, that I have heretofore referred very briefly to the fact that this is a question, after all, of peace and war. It is a question of peace and war. Other Senators have the right to have any opinion they see fit to have in regard to war. I have the right to have my poor opinion in regard to peace.

I am at an age now, sir, when war is to me, as President Wilson described it, a terrible thing. I am at an age now, sir, when I firmly believe that any man who would take this country into war, when his judgment is against it or his conscience tells him otherwise, would be doing the greatest disservice he could do unto this country.

Tonight we speak the last word. It is the last word that deals with this subject of war. If Senators upon this side of the Chamber—I am in a place where I ought not to be perhaps—can be cajoled or can be threatened or in any other way induced to vote for war against their better instincts and their better manhood, then I say they will do something unto their country they can never undo, and I say that at 75 years of age I do not want upon my soul the infamy of taking this country into war when I believe fully it ought not to be taken into war.

Mr. President, we have heard the question of what war means and what peace means so often broached on both sides of this controversy that it would be a work of supererogation for me to discuss it further; it would be idle for me to tell the Senate what war means or what peace means. It would be useless for me to say to any of my colleagues that they are ruining their country. They do not want to ruin it any more than I do. Their motives are just as pure as mine, I take it. They ought to be. If they are not, they should be ashamed of themselves. But I believe their motives are just as pure as mine, and they ought not to want to take their country into any path at the end of which is ruin, and ruin is at the end of this vote which is about to be cast tonight.

Mr. President, yesterday we gave to Russia \$1,000,000,000. We gave her the greatest loan ever given to any nation, I think, within the memory of man. We gave Russia \$1,000,000,000 to do with just as she saw fit. Then, can Senators say that there is no danger in what they do?

I shall not now argue the right or the wrong of the sinking of any particular vessel. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. WALSH] has the records. They show no wrong, perhaps, upon one side of this controversy. They speak for themselves. Senators can see them if they wish to. If they do not wish to, they can close their eyes and say nothing concerning them.

I speak now of money, and I speak of it in the secondary aspect alone. The money we have expended in our preparation for war and the money we have loaned to other countries is an amount large enough to ruin any country on the face of the earth. I do not see how our country is ever going to repay the money to those from whom it has been borrowed or get back that which we have loaned to others. Money has been loaned to almost every country that can be thought of. The administration fights in every sea of the world. The administration permits our ships to pass through every ocean and every bay, and then expects to get off scot free.

But, Senators, it is war, war, it is war that you cannot afford, that I cannot afford, that none of us as Americans can afford. I am simply an American. I care not for Great Britain or "Bundles for Britain." I care not for Germany and Hitler's crimes. I care not for Russia and Russia's greed. I care not for any of those countries. I am only an American, claiming the right to speak as an American in an American Con-

gress. There have been too few words spoken in the American fashion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California on the amendment has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I shall take time on the joint resolution.

Take these things by themselves; put down in a column of figures exactly what the liabilities of this country are today. Write them down and tell them off, and then say to the people of this land, "There is no danger of war; there is no danger of any kind or character." Write them down in any fashion you choose; write them with all the peculiar ambiguities which are established by the White House; and when you are through, there is a staggering amount of money due this people, which we never again can pay.

What do you say to it? You say, "We have the freedom of the seas." Do you not realize that Wilson surrendered the freedom of the seas in his last campaign? Do you not realize that when he, the greatest man in the world at that time, acclaimed by the common people in every country on earth, and whose meetings were greater than those ever held by man before, asked for the freedom of the seas he was told instantaneously by Great Britain, "You cannot have freedom of the seas"?

I do not know why we are talking about freedom of the seas. Freedom of the seas will always be denied by Great Britain. I do not care whether she squinted at it in the papers which were drawn up between the Prime Minister and our President. She will never surrender freedom of the seas. Control of the seas is the cornerstone of her prosperity and her empire. She once refused to grant freedom of the seas; we acquiesced, and that was the end of it. When the time comes she will again refuse, we will acquiesce, and that will be the end of it.

It is hard for me to talk. I am an emotional old man. I feel very keenly the great things of life. I feel more keenly than I can say what befalls us in our daily walks. Declare war tonight and, under the Providence of God, every man who votes to do so will live to regret it to the last day of his life.

Recall again the whole system of war. War is not a plaything. It is not something for you or me or somebody else to play with. War is a brutal actuality. We cannot afford war. I cannot afford it. None of us can afford it. In the name of God, in the name of all the mothers of this land, and in the name of all those who have been asking our assistance and intervention in this controversy, I appeal to the better part of the nature of all Senators. Do not declare war. Do not plunge this country into that sort of holocaust.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand the amendment of the Senator

from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], it is to strike out the last two words, "and section" in line 2, on page 2 of the committee amendment, and all the language in line 3 up to the comma, striking out the word "are" and inserting in place thereof the word "is."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma should be agreed to, would it still be in order for me or any other Senator to offer an amendment striking out the remainder of the first three lines of the committee amendment on page 2?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And if the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma should be rejected, would it still be in order to offer the amendment which I originally offered, striking out all of the first three lines on page 2?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise merely to observe, after the remarks of the distinguished, able, and lovable Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], that I agree with everything he said against war. Of course, we are all against war. If there is any Senator who favors war, I should like to have him rise and say so. There is none.

But some of us believe that the policy which the present administration has pursued has been the best possible means to avoid war. I do not know whether it will avoid war. Perhaps it will not. Probably I should say it will not avoid war, because whether we go to war does not happen to rest in our hands.

Mr. President, all of us are against war. We are going to do the best we can to avoid war, and I think the course we are pursuing is the best course we can pursue to avoid sending our boys abroad and having them die.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma and to be notified at the conclusion of my time on that particular amendment.

A little while ago, in his extremely impassioned and quite eloquent speech, the majority leader of this body referred to memories and anniversaries. In my opinion, the question of memories and anniversaries is one which should haunt every Member of this body tonight as he casts his vote on the question of committing this Nation to the shambles of war.

Yes; anniversaries. Only 1 year ago day before yesterday, Mr. President, the American people went to the polls in this country to cast their votes for the election of a President of the United States. What was their choice? Their choice was between two men, each of whom passionately assured the people of the United States that if he were elected

President of the United States he would keep this people out of war, and keep this people from marching down the path that leads to war. The citizenry had their choice between the platforms of two great national parties, each one of which pledged the United States against involvement in war.

While this does not happen to be the precise anniversary—it is 2 days late—it is so close to it that it ought to make each one of us pause when we think that since that time the American people have been betrayed by both the candidates who sought their favor a year ago yesterday, because both of them have advocated taking us down the path to war, and both of the party platforms—the platform of the Democratic Party and the platform of the Republican Party—have been repudiated, at least to a large extent, by the actions of their responsible spokesmen at that time. That is an anniversary which should be remembered as we vote tonight, Mr. President.

Then there is another anniversary, a more tragic anniversary, which we have not yet reached, but which will be reached next Tuesday, shortly after this body shall have acted on the pending measure, possibly the day before the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to act on it. That is the twenty-third anniversary of the armistice, when the guns were finally stilled, and when men all over the world stood around with watches in their hands and waited for 11 o'clock on the 11th of November for the end of the greatest war in all history—as all of us thought—when we believed we had been fighting a war to end war, when we believed we had been fighting a war to make the world safe for democracy.

Mr. President, from the 11th of November 1918, when 2,000,000 men in American uniforms in Europe—many of them dirty and mud-stained, some of them bloody, some of them wounded, many of them in hospitals—waited for the hour of 11 o'clock and the stiling of the guns to arrive, the promise has been made repeatedly to the fathers and mothers of America, to the veterans of America, to the people of America, that never again would American boys' lives be sacrificed in other people's wars; and, in the majestic language of the Democratic platform of 1940, that American boys would not be sent to die unless we ourselves were attacked. Yet on next Tuesday, Armistice Day—and I mention that because the Senator from Kentucky was talking about anniversaries—we shall have an anniversary which will be on the immediate eve of a vote in the House of Representatives to make effective a repudiation of every one of those promises to the fathers and mothers of America and the people of America.

So, Mr. President, as we vote tonight, between the recurrence of those two great anniversaries—one of the election of 1940, the other of the Armistice of 1918—I think we may well pause to consider those two tremendous betrayals of the American people.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] spoke with eloquence in praising other Members of the Senate; and I should apologize for not taking the time at this hour to

voice any encomiums upon my colleagues in this body, because I have been warned by the public press, upon the authority of the President of the United States, that even 1 minute may be of the most vital importance in the passage of this joint resolution. Therefore, much as I should like to do so, I shall not take the time, as the Senator from Kentucky did, to pass encomiums on either the Senator from Texas, or the Senator from Oklahoma, or any of my colleagues. I recall, however, that the Senator from Kentucky in the course of his remarks stated that the Treaty of Versailles was faulty, and the forerunner of a great many other troubles, because the victors dictated it; and I wonder if the Senator from Kentucky will be able to explain to the Senate who he thinks will dictate the next peace, if there ever is a peace.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky in just a moment, if he will permit me to finish my question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Kentucky tell us if it is not a fact that the British have sworn that they will never permit any sort of a peace that does not involve the absolute dismemberment of Germany. I shall be glad to have him tell us whether he has any assurance that a peace made by Russia, if Russia is victorious, will not involve the absolute subjugation of Finland.

I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky tell me whether he thinks that a peace conference attended by the United States after we were exhausted, as well as every other nation in the world, would give us any better hope of dictating fair terms of peace than we had in 1918.

I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, answering the first question of the Senator from Missouri as to who will dictate the next peace, I wish to say I hope it will not be Hitler.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope so, too.

Mr. BARKLEY. Next, I have never heard that Great Britain had secretly or openly, or in any other way, indicated that she would never agree to any peace which did not involve the dismemberment of Germany.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will take the trouble to read the debates in the House of Commons as reported in the American press, he will have no difficulty in ascertaining that fact.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have trouble enough in keeping up with the debates in the United States Senate. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Missouri on the amendment has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall address the Senate on the joint resolution later.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not desire to get into this debate. I am further from understanding what all the

Senators are driving at than when the debate first began. I merely want to define my position, and then I shall be through.

I am not going to vote to authorize our merchant ships or any other American ships to go into the war zones as proclaimed by the President. Any man who has sense enough, I started to say, to be a citizen—not to be in the United States Senate, because it seems as if those of use who have the least sense come here [laughter]—should realize that the President has defined the war zones, and the belligerents have their vessels there. Mr. President, do you think an American vessel can be loaded with materials for England, with guns and provisions, and that we can expect Germany to say, "Well, go on in," and not shoot hell out of them? That is exactly what the Germans will do. Of course they will, just as happened in the Civil War. Talk about the freedom of the sea. The North had a lot of freedom when they were running the blockade.

I will vote to arm our merchant vessels and authorize them to stay within the zones prescribed by the President, and I will not go any further. I would be an infamous fool, as everybody else here would be, to say we are going to assert the right to send our vessels into a war zone and expect the Stars and Stripes to be respected.

Mr. President, I have listened to this argument ad nauseum. I will tell you the thing for us to do, or the thing I am going to do. I hope I am not like the man who was on the jury. The judge came in and said, "Why in the devil don't you reach a verdict?" The juror said, "There are 11 of the damndest fools in there, and every one of them is agin' me." [Laughter.] I will vote to arm the vessels, and then I want them prohibited by Congress from going into the war zones and inviting a war.

Do we not know that that would be the result? Does anyone think the Russians, the English, or Mr. Hitler would let us carry provisions and arms to their enemies?

As an American citizen, and the oldest Member in point of service in this body—I have been here 33 years—I want to voice my unalterable opposition to American convoys for British ships. People get rich by attending to their own business, and we may have more business on our hands shortly than we anticipate. But I want Congress to assert its power, and dictate what shall be the fate of the American people. They elected you and they elected me to enact legislation. They provided a court to adjudicate between the delegated powers and the reserved powers, and they elected the Executive to execute the laws which we pass.

We have given him some leeway. I said "some," but I will say "all." Yes; we have given him everything. But I want to read the first paragraph of section 3 of the Neutrality Act, so that there will be no misunderstanding about what I am driving at. Section 3 reads:

(a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation,

define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both.

That is what I want. That is plain, practical English. It says there are certain areas into which we can go and have a right to go, and there may be certain others into which we have no right to go. I shall never forget the fateful evening when the message came that the Kaiser had issued a statement that after midnight that night he would prosecute unrestricted U-boat warfare, warning America to take her ships off all the seas. Of course, I voted for war then, and under similar conditions I would vote for it now; but no such proclamation has been issued by Hitler. In case the Germans pass over the zone and into the seas which are not prescribed, and attack our vessels, I want our vessels prepared to defend themselves as best they may; but I am not going to vote here tonight—I do not know what pressure is on others; there has been none on me except my own conscience, and that is pretty weak [laughter]—I am not going to vote with my eyes open to repeal a law which says our ships shall not go into a combat zone. That is a dangerous place; and if they go into it and get shot, the American people will say, "You shot my ship." I want the blood to be on the hands of those who vote to send the boys there.

An undeclared war? No; I want kept as it is section 3 of the Neutrality Act which forbids our ships to go into combat zones. Then, if it is desired to arm vessels, I am perfectly agreeable to that. I think they should be armed. There are mad dogs about everywhere, and there is no telling when it will be necessary to shoot. The propagandists will have it said that they did shoot at us. I am looking for that. Of course, that assertion will be made here immediately. We have propaganda mills running—propaganders and propagandees, too. [Laughter.] I see the geese are in it—the women. We have propaganders and propagandees, and God knows what all.

Whatever we do, let us keep the provision allowing war zones to be defined by the President. Let the belligerent countries fight it out there; but let us by law prohibit our men from rushing in to be shot at and then saying to the American people, "Let us go to war."

I must say to the Senate that I am a little doubtful about the wisdom of my making a speech. If I should get started, I might say much more than it would be wise for me to say. But I am pleading for the preservation of section 3, and then to permit arming our vessels within our own prescribed territory; and, so help me God, that is as far as I am going, and it is as far as any decent American citizen ought to go. If we remove everything, and leave it to those who are trying to rush us into war, I am not deceived about what will happen. There is not a man on this floor who does not know exactly the logical sequence of the events that have been going on for more than a year. Oh, yes; the logical sequence will

be that bombs will begin to drop, not for the sake of America, but for the sake of a few men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Carolina on the amendment has expired.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Chair. I have already, perhaps, said more than I should have said. I have been told that I have 10 minutes on the joint resolution, but probably I had better not take more than a little of it; but I cannot understand how any man on this floor can vote to open the door to arm our ships and send them into the war zone, and then say he is not voting for war. What in the devil is he voting for? [Laughter.] Does he expect the other fellow to let him go right through and say, "Why, yes; that flag is the Stars and Stripes, and you had better not shoot it?" No, Mr. President; it is no time for rotten foolishness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to take time on the joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH. I do. I said so. I feel like turning loose and saying what I am inclined to say. But I have said enough, I suppose.

I hope the Senator will vote to retain the power in the President to prescribe the war zones, and then say to our vessels, "Stay out of them." If Russia and Germany fight and kill each other off, it will suit me exactly.

Someone asked me how I felt about Russia. We were hunting the "reds," chasing them out of this country, and then we send the head devil, Mr. Stalin, a billion dollars. Someone asked me what I thought about it. I said, "I am in favor of that. I would ride the devil as long as he was going toward heaven, but when he turned off I would get down." [Laughter.]

I would use Mr. Stalin to help annihilate Mr. Hitler. I hope they will kill each other off and leave the world in peace. That is how I feel.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would carry out what I desire, leaving section 3, giving power to the President to define the war zones, and then arming our own vessels, but keeping them within the limits which the President defines. That is my position.

If any think I am afraid to fight, just try me personally, and see. [Laughter.] I have heard that miserable suggestion made. Several fellows wired me and said, "Why don't you resign or get on the band wagon?" I said, "I am going to hell fast enough without accelerating my speed by getting on the band wagon." [Laughter.]

If we had a secret ballot here tonight, I do not believe there would be 10 votes against section 3.

Mr. HATCH. Why does the Senator want a secret ballot?

Mr. SMITH. To give some cowards an opportunity to express themselves. That is why I want it. They just have not the courage.

Mr. President, I am through. God knows I would have liked to talk for an hour.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise to resist the amendment offered by my col-

league for two reasons, both of which add up to national defense.

The first reason is that if we leave section 3 in the act, then the United States will be unable to deliver weapons to the men who are resisting Hitler. Therefore, they cannot resist him as effectively as they could if we were able to deliver them more weapons.

If we were able to deliver Russia enough heavy equipment tonight so that Russia would be on a parity with Germany, Russia would stop the Nazi war machine in its tracks tomorrow. That would mean increased security for the United States. Therefore, we should not tie our hands by this self-imposed restriction on the use of our own ships. So, in the interest of our own self-defense, we should remove this limitation so that we can deliver more weapons to the men who are resisting Hitler.

Secondly, I resist the amendment because it would make it impossible for the United States to bring much needed critical materials for our own defense in our own ships.

I wish to refer to some of the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, notably, the testimony of Dr. William Y. Elliott, professor of government in Harvard University, in which he pointed out that it is necessary for the United States to import 1,300,000 tons of manganese every year, and as our defense production increases, he estimated it would reach 1,500,000 tons which it would be necessary for the United States to import every year for the manufacture of weapons.

If we keep this self-imposed restriction, then how are we to bring this necessary material into this country? The material comes from India, Africa, and the Philippines and if war should break out in the Dutch East Indies or in Thailand, under section 3 the President would be required to declare that part of the world a combat zone, or evade the law by subterfuge, to which I do not subscribe.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator know of any instance of the President establishing a war zone in the Far East, or of any way in which the Neutrality Act as at present on the statute books interferes with our importation of manganese, or any of the other essential materials?

Mr. LEE. Of course, the Senator realizes that war flaming suddenly in the East would close all the seas to which he has just referred, or the President would be compelled to adopt the subterfuge of not declaring that part of the world a war zone. I do not subscribe to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will pardon me for a question—as I know his time is limited, there has been a war in the Far East for several years, and the President has not seen fit to declare a war zone. What might occur in the Senator's view, which would prevent the United States from importing any war materials it needed?

Mr. LEE. If Japan should want to force the declaration of a combat zone in the east, Japan could declare war on

China, what is up to now an undeclared war. Then, under the law, it would be necessary for the President to declare that a combat zone, or ignore the law entirely, and I do not subscribe to subterfuge, to forcing the President into a position in which he must choose between the security of this country and resorting to a subterfuge. I do not subscribe to that, and I do not want to have Congress pass legislation which would force the President into such a position.

We import our manganese principally from India, Africa, and the Philippines, and if war should break out over there, or if the Japanese should declare that undeclared war a war, then under the law the President would have to close those seas to our ships, and it would be unlawful for us to bring this necessary manganese to the United States in our own ships.

Furthermore, there is chromite, which is so necessary, and 70 percent of the chromite we need we import. It is necessary for the manufacture of weapons. We get it from the Philippines, from South Africa, and from Rhodesia, all of which would be closed to us if war were declared in the Far East.

Then there is mica, which goes into insulation in the electrical industry.

There is also manila fiber, so necessary in the manufacture of ropes, which will be so essential with our new shipbuilding program. There is no substitute for it. The henequen of Mexico is not a substitute for manila fiber in the manufacture of ropes.

There are rubber and tin, which we import from the Dutch East Indies. If we agree to the amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] we shall close those seas, we shall put ourselves in the position that those seas can by our own law be closed to the use of our own ships to bring to the United States those necessary strategic materials which are necessary in the making of our own weapons.

Therefore, Mr. President, I strongly urge that the Senate reject the amendment and thus not tie our own hands, in a world on fire today, with war spreading to new areas all the time. I urge that this self-imposed limitation on the use of our own ships for our own defense be not continued. Therefore I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment on page 2, lines 2 and 3.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURDOCK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] who is detained in the hospital and is unable to be here to vote. I therefore withhold my vote. I am advised that if the Senator from Washington were present he would vote "yea" on this amendment.

Mr. SPENCER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am advised that if present he would vote "yea." If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I understand if present he would vote "nay." I am advised that I can transfer my pair to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW]. I transfer my pair to him and will vote. I vote "yea." If the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

I am advised that if present the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—38

Adams	Gillette	Taft
Aiken	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Brooks	La Follette	Tydings
Burton	Langer	Vandenberg
Butler	Lodge	Van Nuys
Byrd	McCarran	Walsh
Capper	McNary	Wheeler
Chavez	Maloney	White
Clark, Idaho	Nye	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Shipstead	Willis
Davis	Smith	

NAYS—50

Andrews	George	Murray
Austin	Gerry	Norris
Ballley	Glass	O'Daniel
Ball	Green	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Guffey	Overton
Barbour	Gurney	Pepper
Barkley	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bridges	Herring	Rosier
Brown	Hill	Russell
Bunker	Hughes	Schwartz
Caraway	Kilgore	Smathers
Chandler	Lee	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McFarland	Truman
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Doxey	Maybank	Wallgren
Ellender	Mead	

NOT VOTING—8

Bone	Murdoch	Spencer
Bulow	Reed	Wagner
Hayden	Reynolds	

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment to strike

out lines 1, 2, and 3 at the top of page 2 of the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection, of course, to a vote on the Senator's amendment, to which he is entitled; but the same result would be accomplished by a vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am entirely familiar with that fact; but there has been some "jimmying around" here tonight, and my amendment has been ruled by the Chair to be entirely in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course it is. Let me say to the Senator that I have not been engaged in any "jimmying around."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the Senator has.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now desire, in consideration of my own amendment, to resume the remarks I was making when I was interrupted a few minutes ago.

In his impassioned speech for war, delivered just before or just after 5 o'clock, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] stated his honest opinion that the fighting had stopped too soon in 1918—that we had not fought long enough or far enough. He stated that that has been a view commonly expressed, and to that view he gave his adherence tonight.

Mr. President, some of us heard something to the same effect in November 1918. That opinion was expressed only by men who were in safe positions in the Senate or the House of Representatives, in newspaper offices, or on lecture platforms in this country. I did not hear such a view expressed by men who wore the uniform of the United States at that time, who were glad to see the armistice come along, and who were not among those who were howling to bring the Hun to his knees and go on to Berlin. So I regret to hear the distinguished majority leader, nearly a quarter of a century later, stand on this floor on the eve of practically another declaration of war and say that he thinks we did not go far enough in 1918.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky went on to discuss freedom of the seas. So far as I am advised, for the first time in American history he undertook to characterize the resentment of the American colonists against the Navigation Acts prior to the Revolutionary War as being a fight for freedom of the seas. Every schoolboy in the United States—at least every schoolboy I have ever known—knows that the Navigation Acts, while very much resented, were resented as domestic acts, while we made no profession whatever to not being a part of the British Empire. Nobody ever contended that any question of international freedom of the seas was involved in the Navigation Acts. Nobody ever contended that the Navigation Acts were the controlling cause of our entrance into the Revolution.

I had thought until tonight that everybody was familiar with the fact that the Revolution was caused by a long succession of violations of the rights of the American colonists as Englishmen; and until tonight I never heard the imposition of the Navigation Acts introduced as an exhibition of disregard for freedom of the seas.

I do not desire at this hour of the night to discuss the question of the freedom of the seas at any great length further than to repudiate certain efforts that have been made here today in the course of this debate to take up the old doctrine of freedom of the seas. We ostensibly fought two wars—at least many Senators say so—on the question of freedom of the seas. One was in 1812 and the other in 1917. I wish to call attention to the fact that at neither of the peace conferences following those two wars was the question of freedom of the seas even mentioned in any of the protocols.

At the Treaty of Ghent after the War of 1812 the British flatly refused to discuss the question of the freedom of the seas; and inasmuch as up to the time of the conclusion of the Treaty of Ghent the United States had undoubtedly lost the War of 1812, which was saved only by the Battle of New Orleans, won 3 weeks after the conclusion of the Treaty of Ghent, the American delegates were very glad indeed not to press the question.

As has been said once or twice previously tonight, at the Treaty of Versailles following the war of 1917, as demonstrated from the book of Mr. Churchill, the British flatly refused even to consider in the remotest degree the freedom of the seas. How could anybody talk about the doctrine of freedom of the seas, Mr. President, when the American Secretary of the Navy—God save the mark—Colonel Knox, is going around the country at the present time in the most blatant way announcing that we must form an alliance with England for at least a hundred years. For what? For freedom of the seas? No; not for freedom of the seas. Does anyone contend that if we were to demand freedom of the seas for our ships Great Britain would grant it to us? No, no, Mr. President. Secretary Knox does not advocate freedom of the seas.

He advocates our alliance with England for 100 years for the control of the seas. The British doctrine—and I cannot blame them for it, because it has meant their safety—the British doctrine, for which they have been willing to fight us or any nation of the world, always has been that they must control the seas; and I am ashamed that an American Cabinet officer at this late date should advocate that we must make an alliance with England in which we would play a secondary part, not for freedom of the seas, but for the control of the seas.

Mr. President, one other thing: The Senator from Kentucky in his most impassioned manner, beating the desk and beating his breast, referred to the Spanish War of 1898, and asked how many ships had to be sunk on that occasion before we declared war, whether it was neces-

sary to sink 6 or 7 or 20 ships. No; it was not, he said; only 1 ship had to be sunk.

If the Senator from Kentucky takes any pleasure or any pride in the fact that we declared war on Spain in 1898 because of the blowing up of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Habana, an accident, which has since been indubitably proved to have happened from internal causes, with which Spain had nothing to do—if the Senator from Kentucky takes any pleasure or any pride in the fact that we declared war on Spain about the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, and is willing to declare war again on that basis, I leave that to his own conscience.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURDOCK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], who is detained in a Washington hospital and is unable to be here to vote. Therefore I withhold my vote. I am advised that if the Senator from Washington were able to be here and were voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SPENCER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea." If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], who, I am advised, if present and voting, would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea." I am informed that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—38

Adams	Chavez	La Follette
Alken	Clark, Idaho	Langer
Bibb	Clark, Mo.	Lodge
Brewster	Daneher	McCarran
Brooks	Davis	McNary
Burton	Gillette	Maloney
Butler	Holman	Nye
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith

Taft	Vandenberg	White
Thomas, Idaho	Van Nuys	Wiley
Tobey	Walsh	Willis
Tydings	Wheeler	

NAYS—49

Andrews	Gerry	Norris
Austin	Glass	O'Daniel
Bailey	Green	O'Mahoney
Ball	Guffey	Overton
Bankhead	Gurney	Pepper
Barbour	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Herring	Rosier
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Brown	Hughes	Schwartz
Bunker	Kilgore	Smathers
Caraway	Lee	Stewart
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Truman
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Doxey	Maybank	Walgren
Ellender	Mead	
George	Murray	

NOT VOTING—9

Bone	Murdock	Spencer
Bulow	Reed	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Reynolds	Wagner

So the amendment of Mr. CLARK of Missouri to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, believing that the widely publicized views of the would-be leader of the war party in the United States, Mr. Wilkie, are entitled to be passed upon in this body, since he has accomplished so much of his purpose, much as I am opposed to the nature of the substitute I am about to propose, but believing that it seems better than the emasculation of the Neutrality Act, I send to the desk a substitute for the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Missouri, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. As a substitute for the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Neutrality Act of 1939 is hereby repealed; but offenses committed under such act prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of such act or any rule or regulation issued for the enforcement thereof may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such act had not been repealed.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. HATCH. I was recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I wish to claim the floor in my own right. As the proponent of the amendment, I supposed I would be entitled to prior recognition; but, if the Senator from New Mexico wants to proceed, very well.

Mr. HATCH. No; the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield if the Senator from Texas desires to speak first.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is the author of this amendment—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not. I intend to vote for it because I think it is

better than the despicable amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I simply desire to identify this amendment as the so-called Willkie-Bridges-Austin-Gurney amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. AUSTIN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute. I shall be glad to yield to any of the Senators, so long as my time lasts, if they will permit me to make one brief statement.

Mr. President, I merely desire to identify that amendment as being the exact text of the amendment introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much opposed to the principle of the Willkie amendment; but, as I said in my speech on last Saturday, as between the committee amendment and the Willkie substitute for outright repeal I intend to vote for the Willkie substitute, because I think it is more honorable and more candid with the American people, when we are in effect repealing the Neutrality Act, to say so openly and publicly to the American people, rather than by various sections to strike it down and not be frank enough to say so to the people.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator may or may not remember that I introduced this amendment a month or two ago, before anybody came out for it; and if it came up in the right way—if it came up as being proposed by one who sincerely believed in it—I would vote for it now in preference to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I sincerely believe in it as against the committee amendment. I said so in my speech last Saturday; and I repeat that I sincerely believe in the so-called Willkie amendment as against the committee amendment, because I think it is more honest.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I merely want to ask the Senator from Missouri if he recalls an incident that occurred in October 1939, a certain colloquy between himself and myself respecting an amendment which I then offered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator remember that that amendment, which I offered 2 years ago, was in the identical language of this amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator objects—

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator objects, I am glad to withdraw any imputation of his being associated with Mr. Willkie. [Laughter.] I do not

blame the Senator from Vermont. I did not intend to insult the Senator from Vermont. I really think too much of the Senator from Vermont to associate him in any way with Mr. Willkie. Whoever is responsible for the amendment, I think it is a better amendment than the committee amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think I ought to assure the Senator from Missouri that I am very much honored to know that such a distinguished citizen as the candidate on the Republican ticket for President of the United States saw fit to support openly this amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, when I was a little boy in Missouri, years ago, I heard it said that a blind sow will get an acorn now and then. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Missouri clearly understand that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire submitted this amendment on their own, and that his addition of Mr. Willkie's name to the amendment is wholly adding more generous measure, and that the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont voted against the Neutrality Act in 1937? We were against it then, we are against it today, and we are against it tonight.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I again say that I do not blame the Senator from New Hampshire for his disclaimers of connection with Mr. Willkie. I base my remarks only on the fact that Mr. Willkie, through all the press services and in practically every publication in the United States, claimed the credit or the discredit, as the case might be, of the amendment introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from South Dakota. All I am saying is that in fairness to the undisputed leader of the war party in this country, this proposition, which may have been conceived and sponsored by these three Senators but was claimed by the late putative candidate, the late lamented candidate for President of the United States, should be voted on by the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise to resist the amendment. I wish to say that the effort here to bring in something besides the argument with respect to this measure has been typical of the debate all along.

I have heard the opposition to the measure before the Senate blame Colonel Knox; I have heard them blame the Versailles Treaty for the condition of the world; I have heard them blame Secretary of War Stimson; I have heard them blame Wendell Willkie; I have heard them blame President Roosevelt; but not

once have I heard them blame Hitler, the one who actually is to blame for all this.

I, for one, fought Mr. Willkie all over the city block in the last campaign. Very likely I would not find myself in agreement with him on political or economic questions today; but I congratulate Mr. Willkie for placing his country above his party. I congratulate the Senators on the other side of the aisle for forgetting for a little while their politics and looking to the flag of the country. I am not one to try to tweak their noses because they find themselves shoulder to shoulder with the man who led their party in the last campaign. I congratulate them and I congratulate Mr. Willkie for their move that brought this issue squarely before the people, and helped us get before the Congress the real meat of this joint resolution—that is, the part that really amounts to something—giving us permission and removing the limitation that prevented us from sending our ships where they would do the most good.

Mr. President, let us see what is left in the act which we do not wish to repeal. I do not say that the measure pending before the Senate, namely, the joint resolution for the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6, will not take away the major effect of the Neutrality Act, but there are a number of provisions left in the act, and before Senators vote I wish to enumerate the provisions which will still be left in the act, so that they can decide whether or not they wish to repeal them:

First. There is the provision which regulates the travel of citizens of the United States on belligerent vessels. That in no wise is hindering the Government of the United States in carrying out our foreign policy, but it is useful, and might be useful in the future, and there is no reason for repealing it.

Second. There is the financial provision, which prohibits foreign countries from selling bonds and securities in this country. That might be useful, and there is no reason for repealing it, for it in no wise is hindering the carrying out of our foreign policy.

There is next a provision which prevents the solicitation in this country of funds for different causes in foreign countries. There is no reason for repealing that. Our people have been made the victims of many drives and collections in this country appealing to their sympathy and to their charitableness. There is no reason for repealing that.

There are the restrictions on the use of American ports—a provision inserted because some other countries took advantage of the United States during the World War and used our ports for bringing in ships of other countries. This gives us a law to protect ourselves from that abuse.

Next there is a provision which prohibits the refueling and resupplying of ships of other countries at our ports. For example, without this law a submarine of some foreign country could coast up within 3 or 4 miles of a port, send in a small boat, and get a boatload of supplies, and refuel and resupply.

There is this protection in the law, and there is no reason for repealing that.

Next there is the Munitions Board control. To me that seems very important. As much as anyone in the United States I have been against war profits. I am against them today. More than that, I hope we can do more than we have done to prevent profiteering. Here is a provision which gives the Government of the United States power to prevent the exportation of munitions and supplies without license from the Government. I think it is very necessary that the Government maintain that control over munitions and war supplies.

Finally there is a provision which prevents the misuse of the United States flag by foreign countries. During the World War foreign countries used the United States flag to protect them in ways which are here declared to be unlawful, and this gives the United States some protection in the use of its flag.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we should give the Senator from Missouri the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll. Mr. SPENCER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote, so I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I am paired with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I understand that if present he would vote as I am about to vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present and voting, all of the above-named Senators would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 78, as follows:

YEAS—11

Austin	Gurney	Smathers
Ball	Herring	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—78

Adams	George	Norris
Aiken	Gerry	Nye
Andrews	Gillette	O'Daniel
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barbour	Guffey	Rosier
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lee	Tobey
Caraway	Lodge	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Wallgren
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh
Davis	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Mead	White
Doxey	Murdoch	Willey
Ellender	Murray	Willis

NOT VOTING—7

Bone	Pepper	Wagner
Bulow	Reed	
Hayden	Reynolds	

So the amendment of Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, at this time I wish to say a few words on behalf of the antiviolenence amendment which I shall offer to the pending measure proposing certain changes in the Neutrality Act.

Before entering into the discussion, let me say that I believe this antiviolenence amendment is of such vital importance that in its discussion we should think about it as a fundamental issue and not in terms of personalities or of political consequences. The issues confronting America today are far greater than the political fortunes of any man who may be serving in political life; they are far greater than the success or failure of any individual man who may be holding a place of responsibility in private business or at the head of any business organization or labor organization.

I think, Mr. President, that no one familiar with the history of this country will attempt to say that all men in public life have always, under all conditions, unselfishly served the interests of America. I do not believe that any unbiased man would take the position that all leaders of business organizations have at all times had an unselfish view when dealing with public questions; nor do I think that the thinking man would attribute all the actions of leaders of organized labor today to purely patriotic, unselfish service rendered for the benefit of the workingman.

I might spend the time I have at my command in pointing out our mutual faults, but to do so would only be to magnify the frailties of human nature, and to state again the well-known and well-recognized fact that no individual anywhere is wise enough or good enough to be given absolute control over the welfare of his fellow men. So what I shall say tonight will be directed toward a fundamental issue, toward a system, and not toward the individuals who manage the system.

The great issue before America today, we say, is the problem of national defense. Why are we interested in national defense? What is it that we want to defend?

I, for one, believe that the American people want to defend, above everything else, the individual rights of the individual citizens; the right of a citizen to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; the right to live a life of freedom and liberty, so long as he does not, in the exercise of personal liberty, infringe upon the fundamental rights of society as a whole. I believe the American people want to defend the right of free enterprise in this country when carried on with due regard to the rights of others. I believe America wants to defend the right of the young man who starts out in life to choose and to follow the vocation which to him appears to offer the best opportunity to meet his obligations to society and to live a life that will be pleasing to him and to those dependent upon him. I believe America wants to defend the right to work just as strongly as it does the right to quit work. I think America wants to protect this Nation against all those influences masquerading under the guise of nazism, fascism, and communism, that seek by the use of force and violence to convert the whole world into a dictatorship over which the most ruthless and the most vicious leader of them all may rule.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I am opposed to any and all influences which would destroy the power of democratic government in the world. I am not concerned especially, if we must have dictatorship, about the source from which it comes. No matter what name is given to any great movement controlling the affairs of men, if it leads to dictatorship and to the destruction of democracy, I am against it. I am against a dictatorship of Communists. I am against a dictatorship of the Nazis. I am against a dictatorship of the Fascists. I am against a dictatorship of business. I am against a dictatorship of labor.

So I would answer the question of why we want to defend America, by saying we want to preserve the great principles of freedom written into the Constitution of the United States. If this be true, then the program of national defense must not only go forward now to combat those influences which would establish a dictatorship coming from abroad but we must fight just as vigorously against the establishment of a dictatorship from within. And be not deceived, both battles lie before the American people today.

We are told, Mr. President, by those in authority that this war cannot be won by men alone, but that it must be won by tanks, ammunition, airplanes, bombers, ships, and submarines. We are told that it is the products of American industry which eventually will turn the tide of this battle for world democracy. We do not need to be told this because the facts are self-evident. I think everyone who is familiar with my political career thus far in the United States Senate knows that on every occasion I have expressed my opinion that we should now lend every

possible aid to every nation on the face of the globe where we believe the lending of such aid will result in the destruction of those European leaders who seek by force and violence to rule the world.

But what is the situation in America today? We find many industries of this country which are absolutely essential to national defense tied up with strikes, and in some instances strikes called for one purpose, and one only, and that is to establish a rule that no man can work in these essential industries unless he has first been able to get himself elected to a labor-union membership and paid the extortionate dues demanded.

Mr. President, let me make my position clear. To begin with, I want to say that I am opposed to any legislation now or at any other time the result of which would take away from labor the right to organize or the right to strike or the right to picket. I am opposed to any legislation which would take away from labor the fundamental right to enter into collective bargaining concerning the conditions under which they must work. I do not believe that this emergency should be used as a club to take away from labor rights which it has gained by hard battles over many years. But, on the other hand, I do not think that the Federal Government should stand idly by and see the fundamental rights of our citizens thrown into the discard by a few men who seek to set up a dictatorship of American labor leaders, and to use this emergency as a club to achieve this objective. If the Congress of the United States will write on the statute books of this Nation a few fundamental laws, which should have been there long ago, we shall see a complete change in the whole national picture.

I am perfectly willing to leave it to the honesty and patriotism of the average American workman, whether he be in the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., or in some other organized group, to determine in his own mind when he will work and when he will not work on a national-defense job or on any other job. But I want the law so that it will leave to a man the right to exercise his own choice.

Mr. President, I have proposed to the Senate an antiviolence amendment which in substance provides—

It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or the threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from seeking or accepting employment with a company which is engaged in the performance of a national-defense contract.

The amendment provides a sentence in the Federal penitentiary for those who violate the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I will speak on that.

As I have already stated, I would not deprive labor of any of its legitimate rights, but I would give to every American laboring man "freedom to work"—the right to pick up the tools when another man has laid them down and to proceed with the job of building the ma-

chines which America needs in order to fulfill its obligations to the democracies of the world and to the citizens of this country. I would give our people the right to pick up those tools without fear of being hit over the head with a club or being shot in the back. I would put the protective power of the American Government back of the individual citizens in the exercise of their individual rights. Whenever we do, we shall see strikes begin to stop. The rank and file of American labor, C. I. O., A. F. of L., and all the others, are, in my judgment, not in sympathy with present procedure.

But under a misguided leadership, we have permitted to grow up in this country a system of employment in private industry whereby the average American is no longer able to decide his own problems. Before he can work in any of our defense industries he must first have the permission of the radical leaders of some labor group, and he must, whether he wants to do so or not, pay high tribute to them for the God-given privilege of working, and the Government of the United States has actually encouraged this procedure. There should be written on the statute books of the United States a provision which would make it unlawful for any business organization performing a Government contract to make membership in any organization a prerequisite to employment. The defense effort in America will not go forward so long as the Government of the United States permits the closed shop and the check-off, backed up by the clubs and guns of thugs and goon squads on the picket line.

I believe that every man who works in private industry or in a defense industry should be permitted to join a labor union if he wants to do so and to pay dues to that labor union if he wants to do so, and I believe that every employer should be prevented by law from discriminating against him because he does so. But I also believe that every American workman should have the right to quit the labor union without losing his job, if he wants to quit it. I believe that every American workman who wants to work in defense industries, if he is competent to work, should be given the opportunity to work, regardless of whether he elects to join or to stay out of a labor union. To my way of thinking, these are fundamental principles. If we admit that it is not a function of government to protect the right to work, then I ask you, Mr. President, what function does government have?

A few days ago a man was discussing with me the bill, which I had offered, to make the use of force and violence when used to prevent a man from working a felony, and he made this observation:

Senator, I do not think the leaders of organized labor want to use force and violence, but I am afraid if you were to pass this bill they would accept it as a direct slap in the face of labor; they would assume that the passage of the bill was, at least by indication, saying that they endorsed force and violence.

I said to the man who made that statement:

I think your argument is absolutely foolish. It would be just as reasonable to say that the American people as a whole would be insulted if we passed a law making murder or theft a felony because the passage of such a law would infer that all of the citizens wanted to murder or to steal.

Laws are passed to restrain those who need restraining; and I, for one, believe that the great rank and file of American labor today would welcome the enactment of laws which would protect them in the exercise of their fundamental constitutional right to work—laws that would protect them in their right to join a labor union or to get out of it when they ceased to approve of its actions, without losing their job as a result of their action. I think they would welcome a law which would say that if at any time a strike occurs in this country and one workman lays down his tools, another workman would be protected when he picked up those tools and continued the job, and that he would not be beaten over the head by a club or shot in the back for having done so.

I stated in the beginning, Mr. President, that I simply wished to make a fair statement of principles and facts, without reference to personalities. This I have done. I hope the American people will wake up to the fact that the future of America is at stake. The freedom of our people is at stake. The issue is not complex; it is simple. It can be met now if the Congress of the United States will have the courage to face these issues with their eyes turned toward the future of America instead of having their eyes turned toward the next election.

All are agreed that work of our citizens is the one thing that can win the present world war for democratic government. It is work that will produce the tanks, airplanes, bombers, and munitions of war. It is work backed by capital and directed by skilled management that will turn the tide of battle. It is work of all our citizens which will, when the battle has been won, reestablish free enterprise and free government throughout the world.

That the democracy of the world is threatened by the dictators of Europe is admitted by all. But let us not spend all our time using high-powered telescopes to observe what is going on in Europe and close our eyes to the fundamental things which are striking at the very foundations of free government here in America. America needs today the 100-percent support of all its citizens. No man is worthy of the rights and privileges of American citizenship if he is not willing at this time to do the very best of his ability to do what he believes to be necessary to sustain this country in this great hour of peril. The time is here now for the Government of the United States and the Congress of the United States to face the issues at home and to do the things that are necessary to keep the wheels of the factories of this country moving and to protect the individual rights of every citizen who wants to have a part in this great effort. So far as I am concerned,

regardless of any political consequences which may result, I shall contend for this policy.

If members of an organization known as a labor union have the right to use force and violence to enforce their demands, by what system of justice may we deny the use of force and violence to members of an organization of businessmen, of professional men, of farmers, or of consumers? How can this Congress convince 130,000,000 people of our sincerity by stoutly decrying force and violence abroad and weakly permitting it here at home? If we preach freedom and democracy, why not practice it? This glaring double-standard justice cannot be concealed beneath a cloak of silence, inaction, or clever oratory. Millions of American citizens scattered throughout this Nation are very much disturbed over the fact that our industries are not producing to full capacity, thus carrying their share of the tremendous responsibility of backing up our boys in the Army and Navy who stand ready to do anything, at any time, when the command is issued. The relatives and friends of these soldiers, sailors, and aviators want the assurance that the lives of their loved ones will not be lost for the want of war equipment, kept from being manufactured because of our factories being slowed down or shut down, and our Federal Government sitting idly by tolerating such unjust and un-American tactics.

We have condemned force and violence by Hitler, and have appropriated billions of dollars to stop it. Why not be consistent and condemn force and violence in America and, by adopting my anti-violence amendment, stop it?

Mr. President, I have heard some very able persons make forceful speeches denouncing the shut-downs and slow-downs in our defense industries, but they fail to back up their oratory with any action to stop the shut-downs and slow-downs.

Down in my country the folks call that "pussyfooting." This is no time to "pussyfoot." The opportunity is now here for the Senate to vote on this amendment or to "pussyfoot."

Mr. President, I have made no statement with reference to the pending revision or repeal of the Neutrality Act. After listening attentively for many days to the speeches of able Senators on both sides of the question I am inclined to believe that the subject has been over-advertised, or perhaps inadvertently mis-advertised. The proposed revision has been advertised by one side as a vehicle for getting us into the war, and by the other side it has been advertised as a vehicle to keep us out of the war.

I have the most profound respect for the able Senators who have spoken on both sides of this question. I admire their sincerity; but I fear that the subject has been covered so broadly that the impression has been created in the minds of many persons who have read only fragmentary parts of the many lengthy addresses that we are actually voting on whether we shall enter into the war.

Technically that is not a fact; and as I have not heard this statement put into the RECORD, I shall make it so that the RECORD may be kept straight. We are not voting on a declaration of war, and I doubt the ability of any living man to prophesy accurately what will happen in the future with reference to our participation in the war as the result of the action we shall take on the revision of the Neutrality Act.

My humble and honest opinion is that the proposed revisions whether approved or defeated will have very little, if any, effect on our entry into or our keeping out of the war or our degree of participation in the war. The degree of our participation in the war will, in my opinion, be determined by the unfriendly actions of the aggressor nations against our rights on the one hand, and the actions of our President on the other hand in performing his constitutional duties and responsibilities in protecting our rights. He has been elected by the votes of the United States and has certain duties and responsibilities on his shoulders, and they are not the responsibilities of me or of any Member of this Congress, or of any other citizen of this Nation.

With this neutrality law on our statute books our Navy now has instructions to shoot at other nations and other nations are shooting at us. With that fact known and admitted, why argue that the law's further continuance on our statute books will stop the shooting or prevent further shooting? We might as well be practical, and realize that this Neutrality Act has very little, if any, influence on our war activities. I regret that so many of our people have been led to believe that a vote for the revision or repeal of this Neutrality Act will put us into war and a vote against it will keep us out of war or vice versa. I do not think that is true.

Whether we are in the war now or not, we do need war implements and ammunition. We cannot build war implements and ammunition in closed factories. Some of our factories are closed down. Let us do something constructive and practical while we are here. Let us put an amendment on this resolution which will mean something. Let us put on an amendment which will assure some of our patriotic laboring people that they can go into these closed factories and start the wheels turning, without fear of being hit over the head or shot by somebody who does not want them to work at a lawful and patriotic job of their own choice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired. Has the Senator offered his amendment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I have offered the amendment, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read, for the information of the Senate, the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. As the end of section 2 it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat

of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from seeking or accepting employment with a company which is engaged in the performance of a national-defense contract.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons to assemble at or near any plant or other place owned, leased, or occupied by a company which is engaged in the performance of a national-defense contract, if a labor dispute exists at such plant or place, and force or violence, or threat of force or violence, is used to prevent or attempt to prevent any person from seeking or accepting employment with such company, or for any person to promote, encourage, or aid any such assemblage at which such force or violence, or threat thereof, is so used.

(c) Any person who violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

(d) As used in this section—

(1) The term "company" includes an individual, a partnership, company, corporation, or association.

(2) The term "national-defense contract" means a contract—

(A) with the United States for the construction, erection, reconstruction, installation, transportation, production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of property, or the furnishing of property or services, for use by the land or naval forces of the United States; or

(B) with the United States for the construction, reconstruction, or repair of any vessel; or

(C) whether or not with the United States, for the construction, erection, reconstruction, or installation of any building, structure, machinery, equipment, or facility for use by the land or naval forces of the United States or for use by any person in the production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of property for use by the land or naval forces of the United States; or

(D) whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of any article described in Proclamation No. 2237 promulgated by the President on May 4, 1937; or

(E) whether or not with the United States, for the construction, erection, reconstruction, or installation of any building, structure, machinery, equipment, or facility for use by any person in the production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of any article described in Proclamation No. 2237 promulgated by the President on May 4, 1937.

(e) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the section and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(f) This section shall cease to apply upon the expiration of the emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, except that offenses committed in violation of this section prior to its expiration may be prosecuted and punished after such expiration in the same manner and to the same extent as if such section had not expired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURDOCK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SPENCER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and will vote. I vote "yea." I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS from Idaho (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay." I vote "nay." I am advised that, if present, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—50

Andrews	Gerry	Norris
Austin	Glass	O'Daniel
Bailey	Green	O'Mahoney
Ball	Guffey	Overton
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hatch	Rosier
Barkley	Herring	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Schwartz
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bunker	Kilgore	Spencer
Caraway	Lee	Stewart
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Truman
Doxey	Maybank	Tunnell
Ellender	Mead	Wallgren
George	Murray	

NAYS—38

Adams	Davis	Smith
Aiken	Gillette	Taft
Bilbo	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Burton	La Follette	Vandenberg
Butler	Langer	Van Nuys
Byrd	Lodge	Walsh
Capper	McCarran	Wheeler
Chavez	McNary	White
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Willis
Danaher	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—8

Bone	Murdoch	Reynolds
Bulow	Pepper	Wagner
Hayden		

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If no further amendment be proposed, the question is, Shall the amendment be engrossed and the joint resolution be read a third time?

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY. On the final passage of the joint resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURDOCK (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]. I am advised that if the Senator from Washington were present he would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SPENCER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "nay." I transfer my pair with him to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]—who, I am advised, would vote "yea" if present—and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who, if present, would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW]—who, if present, would vote "nay"—and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, before the result is announced, I inquire whether the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is recorded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is not recorded as voting.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has been unexpectedly called from the Senate Chamber. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recorded as being absent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, how is the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is not recorded as voting.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for a recapitulation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that under the Senate rules there is an automatic recapitulation, and it has already been had. The evident purpose of the request of the Senator from Kentucky is to afford time for a Senator who is absent to get here. I make the point of order that the recapitulation provided in the Senate rules has already been had.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the position taken by the Senator from Missouri.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—50

Andrews	Glass	O'Daniel
Austin	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Rosier
Barbour	Herring	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Schwartz
Bridges	Hughes	Smathers
Brown	Kilgore	Spencer
Bunker	Lee	Stewart
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McKellar	Truman
Doxey	Maybank	Tunnell
Ellender	Mead	Wallgren
George	Murray	White
Gerry	Norris	

NAYS—37

Adams	Davis	Smith
Aiken	Gillette	Taft
Bilbo	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Burton	La Follette	Vandenberg
Butler	Langer	Van Nuys
Byrd	Lodge	Walsh
Capper	McCarran	Wheeler
Chavez	McNary	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Nye	
Danaher	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—9

Bone	Hayden	Reed
Bulow	Murdock	Reynolds
Downey	Pepper	Wagner

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I desire to announce that it is my purpose to move, at the conclusion of business today, that the Senate adjourn until Monday, and that on Monday the calendar will be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

SUGAR QUOTAS—AMENDMENT OF THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself, I introduced a bill to extend and to amend the Sugar Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at length in the body of the RECORD, together with a statement which I have prepared explanatory of the bill. I may add that this measure is identical with a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative FULMER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1937 as amended (relating to establishment and revision of quotas) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 202. Whenever a determination is made, pursuant to section 201, of the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers, the Secretary shall establish quotas, or revise existing quotas—

"(a) For domestic sugar-producing areas by prorating among such areas 56.77 percent of such amount of sugar (but not less than 3,793,802 short tons) on the following basis:

Area:	Percent
Domestic beet sugar.....	42.49
Mainland cane sugar.....	11.52
Hawaii.....	24.72
Puerto Rico.....	21.03
Virgin Islands.....	24

"(b) For foreign countries, and the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, by prorating 43.23 percent of such amount of sugar (except, if such amount of sugar is less than 6,682,670 short tons, the excess of such amount over 3,793,802 short tons) on the following basis:

Area:	Percent
Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands.....	34.70
Cuba.....	64.41
Foreign countries other than Cuba.....	.89

In no case shall the quota for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands be less than the duty-free quota now established by the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act as amended.

"The quota for foreign countries other than Cuba shall be prorated among such countries on the basis of the division of the quota for such countries made in General Sugar Quota Regulations, Series 4, No. 1, issued December 12, 1936, pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended."

Sec. 2. That section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937 as amended (relating to redistribution of deficits in area quotas) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. (a) The Secretary shall, as he deems necessary during the calendar year, determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugar beets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any domestic area, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, or

Cuba, will be unable to market the quota for such area. If the Secretary finds that any domestic area or Cuba will be unable to market the quota for such area for the calendar year then current, he shall revise the quotas for the domestic areas and Cuba by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined to the other areas, on the basis of the quotas then in effect. Any portion of such sugar which the Secretary determines cannot be supplied by domestic areas and Cuba shall be prorated to foreign countries other than Cuba on the basis of the prorations of the quota then in effect for such foreign countries. If the Secretary finds that the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands will be unable to market the quota for such area for the calendar year then current, he shall revise the quotas for domestic sugar-producing areas, for Cuba, and for foreign countries other than Cuba, by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined, as follows:

"(1) To the domestic beet-sugar area and to the mainland cane-sugar area, on the basis of the respective quotas for such areas then in effect, an amount equivalent to such part, if any, of such deficit as the Secretary determines is due to inability to market in continental United States the amount of refined sugar permitted to be brought into continental United States, duty free, under the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act, as amended;

"(2) To foreign countries other than Cuba, on the basis of the prorations of the quotas for such foreign countries then in effect, an amount not in excess of 100,000 short tons of the remainder of such deficit, after giving effect to the foregoing subsection (a) (1);

"(3) To Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Cuba, on the basis of the respective quotas for such areas then in effect, the remainder, if any, of the amount of such deficit in excess of 100,000 short tons, after giving effect to the foregoing subsection (a) (1).

Provided, however, That no part of any such Philippine deficit so prorated may be filled by direct-consumption sugar except that part, if any, prorated pursuant to the foregoing subsection (a) (1).

"(b) If, on the 1st day of September in any calendar year, any part or all of the proration to any foreign country of the quota in effect on the 1st day of July in the same calendar year for foreign countries other than Cuba, has not been filled, the Secretary may revise the proration of such quota among such foreign countries, by prorating an amount of sugar equal to such unfilled proration to all other such foreign countries which have filled their prorations of such quota by such date, on the basis of the prorations then in effect.

"(c) If the Secretary finds that any foreign country other than Cuba will be unable to market any part or all of the proration to such foreign country for the calendar year then current, the Secretary may increase the quotas for other foreign countries, for the domestic sugar-producing areas and for Cuba, by prorating an amount of sugar, equal to the deficit so determined, as follows:

"(1) To such foreign countries other than Cuba, on the basis of the prorations of the quotas for such foreign countries then in effect, such portion of such deficit as the Secretary finds they will be able to market in the calendar year then current;

"(2) To the domestic sugar-producing areas and Cuba on the basis of the respective quotas for such areas then in effect, the remainder, if any, of such deficit.

"(d) The quota for any domestic area, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, or Cuba, or other foreign countries, shall not

be reduced by reason of any determination made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) or subsection (c) of this section 204."

Sec. 3. Section 207 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to direct consumption sugar from Cuba), is amended by striking out "three hundred and seventy-five thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "three hundred thousand."

Sec. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. (a) The amount of the base rate of payment shall be 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar or liquid sugar, raw value."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The total payment with respect to a farm shall be the product of the base rate specified in subsection (a) of this section multiplied by the amount of sugar and liquid sugar, raw value, with respect to which payment is to be made, except that reduction shall be made from such total payment in accordance with the following scale of reductions:

That portion of the quantity of sugar and liquid sugar which is included within the following intervals of short tons, raw value:	Reduction in base rate of payment per cwt. of such portion
350 to 700.....	\$0.05
700 to 1,000.....	.10
1,000 to 1,500.....	.20
1,500 to 3,000.....	.25
3,000 to 6,000.....	.275
6,000 to 12,000.....	.30
12,000 to 30,000.....	.325
More than 30,000.....	.50

Sec. 5. (a) Section 101 (f) of the Sugar Act of 1937 as amended (relating to the definition of liquid sugar) is amended by striking out "6 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 percent."

(b) Section 401 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to the definition of "manufactured sugar"), is amended by striking out "6 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 percent."

Sec. 6. Section 513 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to termination of powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 513. The powers vested in the Secretary under this act shall terminate on December 31, 1944, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1944 and previous crop years."

Sec. 7. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes under the Sugar Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3508. TERMINATION OF TAXES

"No tax shall be imposed under this chapter on the manufacture, use, or importation of sugar after June 30, 1945."

Sec. 8. Section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to payments to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1942" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945."

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING, ON THE SUGAR BILL INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE ON NOVEMBER 7, 1941, BY CONGRESSMAN FULMER IN THE HOUSE AND BY SENATORS O'MAHONEY, ADAMS, AND ELLENDER IN THE SENATE

In an effort to meet realistically the complex problem of sugar supply for the consumers of the United States caused by the national-defense emergency and the marked

increase of sugar consumption, a sugar bill has been introduced in the Senate and in the House today to provide a continuation of the Sugar Act for 3 years and to enact several much-needed amendments.

During the past year the Secretary of Agriculture has found himself obliged to make several increases of the estimate of consumption by which, under the sugar law, production is governed, and at the present time all limits are off. Shipping shortages and increased purchases have brought about a condition which compels increased production of sugar beets and sugarcane in continental United States if the country is to escape the danger of rationing or, in the absence of effective price legislation, an increased cost to the consumers such as was experienced during the World War.

To the degree that ships are required for the transportation of strategic minerals and war materials they will be lacking for the transportation of sugar supplies to the United States from offshore areas, and unless production within the boundaries of continental United States is stimulated sugar consumers are extremely likely to be confronted with a short supply. The Sugar Act is the best insurance against such a condition. The amendatory provisions contained in the bill introduced today are intended—

First. To extend the basic law for 3 years.

Second. To increase the minimum continental quota so that growers who are asked to increase their production will not be looking forward to an inevitable reduction in acreage when the emergency is passed.

Third. To meet the increased costs of production by reason of the increased cost of labor and materials by a slight advance of the conditional payment to growers scaled down in such a manner as not to increase payments made to the larger growers of sugar beets and sugarcane.

Fourth. A reallocation of sugar supplies which the Philippines may be unable to deliver.

Fifth. An amendment of the provision which governs the importation of sugar in liquid form so as to correct a deficiency in the present law which allows sugar to come in as sirup without regard to either the tax or quota provisions of the law.

Section 1 of the bill increases the minimum total quota of all domestic sugar producing areas from 3,715,000 to 3,793,802 tons. This means a 4-percent increase for the domestic beet sugar area, or 62,088 tons, and a 4-percent increase amounting to 16,880 tons for mainland sugarcane. The percentages of the total quota have been so arranged for all of the areas as to make substantially no change in the quotas for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands while increasing the quota for the continental areas, without which, of course, the effort to provide an adequate supply for continental consumers in the present emergency would not be successful.

The continental increase is accomplished by a reduction of the Cuban quota, of the Philippine quota, and of the quota for countries other than Cuba. These reductions have been made in order to afford the opportunity to increase the quotas of the continental areas.

If the total consumption in continental United States were 6,682,670 tons, Cuba's quota would be reduced by 50,791 tons, that of the Philippines by 27,363 tons, and that of foreign countries other than Cuba by 702 tons.

Section 2 of the bill deals with the reallocation of a deficit in the Philippine quota. Under the law as it stands, this deficit goes only to foreign countries other than Cuba. The amendatory bill provides that the domestic beet sugar areas and the mainland cane sugar areas would share proportionately in

any deficit of duty free, refined sugar from the Philippines. The first 100,000 tons of the remainder of any deficits would go to foreign countries other than Cuba and the balance would be distributed proportionately to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Cuba. None of this deficit, except that which goes to continental beet and cane areas, is to be filled by direct-consumption sugar.

With respect to the quota of any foreign country other than Cuba which is unable to send in its allotment, the amendment provides that such deficit shall be prorated, first, to the remaining foreign countries and, second, to domestic sugar producing areas and to Cuba.

Section 3: Without changing the Cuban total quota, it reduces the amount of white sugar that may be imported from Cuba from 375,000 to 300,000 tons.

Section 4 deals with the conditional payments and while it increases the basic rate from 60 to 80 cents, the scale-down is so arranged as to provide no increased payment to the larger producers. The purpose of this section is to recognize increased costs particularly for the small farmer and rancher. These costs have been substantial as indicated by the figures gathered by the Agricultural Marketing Service which show that the labor costs in the beet area are now 20.8 percent greater than they were during the parity period. The last wage determination made under the Sugar Act increased wages in 1940 for the beet areas 6.4 percent above what they were in 1937. Defense industry and priorities are now operating to make the labor costs even greater. The full increase from 60 to 80 cents by the amendment goes only to producers of less than 350 tons.

In this connection it is worth while pointing out that the consumption of sugar has increased so rapidly since the beginning of the emergency that the processing tax, which is paid by the processors and the growers, will produce \$80,000,000 instead of \$68,000,000 in previous years. This revenue is more than sufficient to bear all of the costs of administration of the Sugar Act and to meet the conditional payments.

Section 5 amends the definition of liquid sugar in order to meet the complaints of the sugar industry that under the present definition as much as 40,000 tons of sugar is brought into the United States annually in the form of sirup without being charged against the quota of any exporting country and without paying the tax which is paid by all other growers and processors.

Section 6 extends the act, which now expires on December 31, 1941, for 3 years, to December 31, 1944.

Section 7 continues the tax for the same period.

Section 8 extends for 3 years the provisions of the present law relating to the refund of taxes collected on sugars produced from sugarcane grown in the Philippines.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ben Moreell to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, with the rank of rear admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 10, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 7 (legislative day of October 27), 1941:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Ben Moreell to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from December 1, 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Lesbia G. Moore, Belle Rive.
William J. Dolamore, Franklin Park.
Lorraine Riley, Kell.
Thomas Edward Mostyn, Midlothian.
Henry B. Reiss, St. Peter.
Irene C. Cinnamon, Steger.
Kate M. Weis, Teutopolis.
Lawton C. Spangler, Woodlawn.

NORTH CAROLINA

W. Reid Howe, Cramerton.
Victor N. Fair, Lincolnton.
Artus E. Howell, Oakboro.
Mae S. Ray, Whitakers.
Mary P. Williams, Whittier.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. L. B. Keegan, of St. James Catholic Church, La Crosse, Wis., offered the following prayer:

We invoke the blessing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost upon this august group of lawmakers entrusted with the great responsibility of directing our Nation at this perilous time. In this hour of international and national turmoil and chaos we implore God to direct these men, our Representatives, and grant to them the wisdom to realize that only through a return to the law of God as made known to man through the Ten Commandments can order and law and peace be restored. Give them the wisdom to understand